

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE



Bulletin

Vol. XXXVI, No. 928

APR 13 1957

April 8, 1957

MAIL
LIBRARY

UNITED STATES AND UNITED KINGDOM EXCHANGE VIEWS AT BERMUDA MEETING • <i>Text of Joint Communiqué</i>	561
THE UNITED NATIONS AND PUBLIC UNDERSTAND- ING • <i>by Assistant Secretary Wilcox</i>	555
AMENDING THE U.S. INFORMATION AND EDUCA- TIONAL EXCHANGE ACT OF 1948 • <i>Statement by E. Allan Lightner, Jr.</i>	566
AIR TRANSPORT AGREEMENT BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND MEXICO • <i>Department Announcement and Text of Agreement</i>	575
NOTICE OF INTENTION TO ENTER INTO LIMITED TRADE AGREEMENT NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE UNITED KINGDOM AND BELGIUM	581
THE COLD WAR AND THE UNIVERSITIES • <i>Article by Frederick Cable Oechsner</i>	571

For index see inside back cover

THE
OFFICIAL
WEEKLY RECORD
OF
UNITED STATES
FOREIGN POLICY

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Bulletin

VOL. XXXVI, No. 928 • PUBLICATION 6473

April 8, 1957

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication issued by the Public Services Division, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes selected press releases on foreign policy, issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, United Nations documents, and legislative material in the field of international relations are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:
52 issues, domestic \$7.50, foreign \$10.25
Single copy, 20 cents

The printing of this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (January 19, 1955).

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

Th

I
some
Nati
attem
Midd
It ha
the r
shad
shou
Unit
with
threa

Set
to su
throu
well-l
the A

We
nation
ciples
the us
betwe
arises
tions,
in our
ter, w

The
which
is not
standi

¹ Add
Women
160).

April 8

The United Nations and Public Understanding

by Francis O. Wilcox

Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs¹

I am glad to have the opportunity to discuss some aspects of critical issues before the United Nations. The intense glare of publicity that has attended the negotiations on Hungary and on the Middle East has not always been illuminating. It has at times highlighted the unessential, even the nonexistent, and at other times cast into deep shadow the main lines of policy and action. I should like to try to set in focus the role of the United States and the United Nations in dealing with world problems, especially aggression and threats to the peace.

Set in simple terms, it is United States policy to support the United Nations and to work through it to establish and maintain peace and well-being among nations. We believe it holds the best hope for the security and well-being of the American people.

We attempt to conduct our relations with other nations in conformity with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. We avoid the use of force as a means of settling disputes between ourselves and other states. If a problem arises which properly belongs in the United Nations, we use our influence to bring it there. If, in our opinion, it is not a United Nations matter, we urge its settlement by other means.

The United Nations is a political organization which has its proper uses and its limitations. It is not a remedy for all the world's ills. Misunderstanding on this score is, I think, the basis of

most criticism of both the United States role in the United Nations and the role of the United Nations when attempting to deal with world crises.

Limitations of the United Nations

This past year has been a year of grave tests for the United Nations and a time of peril for world peace. The situations that arose in Egypt and in Hungary provided both the peril to mankind and the tests for the United Nations. These issues have in common the fact that military force was used by one nation against another. This is the ultimate issue the United Nations was designed to meet and solve. The degree of success achieved by the United Nations in restoring peace with justice is a gage of its capabilities and its limitations as a peace-enforcing institution. Even more important, it is a measure of the extent to which member states will permit it to perform its peacemaking functions.

The criticism has been leveled at the United Nations that it has proved weak and ineffective. This was charged not only in the case of Hungary, because of the Assembly's inability to get the Soviet Union to withdraw its forces, but also in the Middle East when compliance with the recommendations of the General Assembly lagged.

We must face the fact that, with great-power disunity reflected in the Security Council, the United Nations is handicapped in preventing breaches of the peace and bringing about restoration of peace. The role of the General Assembly is largely one of discussion and recommendation.

This does not mean, however, that the United Nations is without power to influence the conduct

¹ Address made before the National Council of Jewish Women at Washington, D.C., on Mar. 19 (press release 160).

of nations. In some ways it may be likened to the role of the policeman in a community. In a well-ordered community he is a symbol of law and order, an arbiter, created by the community for its own protection. Called in on a dispute, he is not set upon by the mob. He is *permitted* to exercise a power which he does not, in himself, possess. But this means that the community must be back of him.

The world, unfortunately, is not yet wholly made up of such communities. The General Assembly must still play a limited role based largely on the constructive power of world public opinion. This state of affairs has not been fully appreciated in the two great issues with which the United Nations is still seized.

The United States, because of the leading role it has played in this General Assembly, has shared to a considerable degree both the public approval of the United Nations successes and the criticisms of its failures.

In this connection, may I remind you that the United Nations can only do what its members want and permit it to do. We should not make the mistake of blaming the organization for the doubts, the uncertainties, and shortcomings displayed by its members.

The Crises In Egypt and Hungary

The problems presented to the United Nations by the crises in Egypt and Hungary are well known. There was a fundamental difference in the nature of these problems, however. In Hungary Soviet troops, ostensibly there to protect Hungarian territory from outside aggression, turned their guns inward against the defenseless Hungarian people. In Egypt, on the other hand, the clash was between the armed forces of the states involved.

Moreover, the Israeli attack occurred after a long series of serious provocations and violations of the Armistice Agreement. There was no such conceivable excuse in the case of the Soviet use of armed force against Hungary.

Events so turned out that the United States found itself taking the lead in United Nations action in the case of both Egypt and Hungary. In neither instance did we really have any choice of the role we were to play. Both were instances of the use of force against the territorial integrity of another state.

In the former case, it was our grievous task to bring the charge of violation of the United Nations Charter against our friends and allies; in the latter, against a government and a system which is the implacable foe of freedom.

We pride ourselves on being a nation of laws, not of men. The charter likewise provides that nations conduct their relations on the basis of international law and justice. We had to say to ourselves that, if we ever hope to get anywhere with the peaceful settlement of disputes, we must constantly take a stand against recourse to military force, as a matter of principle and in the interest of our own Nation as well as world peace. Speaking to the Nation on the Middle East situation on February 20,² President Eisenhower said: "It is an issue which can be solved if only we will apply the principles of the United Nations."

Our reason for going to the United Nations, then, was to defend this fundamental principle—not because we were pro-Arab or pro-Israel or anti-Russian or because we were for or against any state or group of states.

I think there was no lack of public support in this country for the decisions taken by the United Nations on both areas of conflict. There was, however, great public impatience with the delay in the Middle East and the flat refusal in Hungary to comply with the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly. It was quickly forgotten that in both cases what the United Nations was trying to do was dependent on the voluntary cooperation of the offending states and the states offended against. The reason for this, of course, is that only the Security Council may take decisions of a compulsory character in such instances. With the power of the Security Council weakened by the veto, the United Nations has had to fall back on the General Assembly, which has only the power to recommend.

Given these circumstances, we should be encouraged by what the United Nations has so far accomplished in the Middle East. It has shown that the conscience and the moral consensus of the vast majority of United Nations members, when the chips are down, favor peaceful settlement of disputes and adherence to commitments assumed under the charter, even when such course

² BULLETIN of Mar. 11, 1957, p. 387.

seems to run counter to individual national interests.

In the case of Hungary, the United Nations' inability to secure compliance with its repeated recommendations has caused deep concern not only among the American people but among free peoples everywhere. In the circumstances, it has been natural for segments of public opinion to oversimplify the problem in seeking to place the blame. It has been charged that the United Nations is weak and futile; it has been urged that Hungary and the Soviet Union be thrown out of the United Nations for their defiance; it has been argued that the United Nations and the United States have applied a "double standard"—one for the weak and one for the strong.

I would like to attempt some clarification of this latter point. In his broadcast to the American people on October 31st⁸ President Eisenhower said: "There can be no peace without law. And there can be no law if we were to invoke one code of international conduct for those who oppose us and another for our friends."

Though he was speaking about the attack on Egypt, the record shows that the United States and the United Nations consistently adhered to this principle. The standard applied to the use of force in Egypt was likewise applied in Hungary. The essential difference was that the countries directly concerned in the Middle East crisis responded to offers of United Nations assistance to bring about a peaceful settlement. In Hungary, such assistance was refused. Had the response been the reverse, there would now be no United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East, with a deterioration of the situation there which I leave to your imagination.

The Hungarian Situation

The crux of the problem of Hungary was, what can the United Nations do when one of the major powers refuses to cooperate with the General Assembly?

The answers are fairly simple but not very satisfactory. We could attempt to expel it from the United Nations. This is obviously not a practical solution since the concurrence of the permanent members of the Security Council is required.

⁸*Ibid.*, Nov. 12, 1956, p. 743.

The General Assembly could recommend certain political measures, such as breaking diplomatic relations. Unless it could persuade a large proportion of United Nations members to cooperate, this would not be a very effective sanction and in the case of the United States would cut us off from a useful diplomatic contact.

The General Assembly could also recommend economic sanctions. Again, unless a large number of nations could be persuaded to join in such sanctions, the pressure exerted would be relatively slight. This is especially the case with the U.S.S.R. and its satellites, whose total resources are great and whose economic relations with the West are already on a very small scale.

There is, of course, the possibility of attempting to introduce United Nations observers, but their entrance would require the consent of the state concerned.

The final recourse would be to recommend the use of military forces. There is not the remotest likelihood, with the dangers involved in the atomic age, that the United Nations would vote for such action.

Depressing as this picture may be, it reflects the situation in which the world finds itself today. This does not mean, however, that, because outlaws exist in the world community, the rule of law should not be applied wherever possible.

May I add a word about the so-called "double standard." This is nothing new. In effect, the double standard was built into the charter when the veto provision was inserted. This gave the great powers a privileged position in the organization.

But I think that we seriously misread recent history if we believe United Nations resolutions on Hungary failed to have a harmful impact on the Soviet Union and its satellite system. These resolutions put the Soviet Union's barbarous misdeeds squarely under the white light of world opinion. They did more to expose the diabolical nature of international communism than almost anything that has happened since World War II. Perhaps more important, the inherent weakness of a system that has to rely on force alone to impose its will on the majority was shockingly revealed.

The Secretary of State at Canberra last week said, "Throughout the satellite area, there is a revulsion against the brutal colonialism and ex-

ploitation of Soviet imperialism." It is my opinion that this revulsion, as a result of the facts revealed in General Assembly debate, has extended to the corners of the free world.

The Middle East

There was a great deal of public controversy over the possibility of the United Nations' imposing sanctions against Israel. Now it is true that at one time it appeared that a majority of United Nations members might have tried to impose sanctions if other methods had failed to bring about Israel troop withdrawal from Egypt and the Gaza Strip. As a member of the United Nations, the United States would have had to take its stand on such an issue should it have arisen.

We believed it essential that Israel should withdraw in its own best interests. This we felt was a necessary prelude to a solution of other problems in the Middle East.

I think it significant that the use of traditional bilateral diplomacy to supplement United Nations action in the Middle East was of major importance in preventing the matter of sanctions from becoming a divisive issue in the United Nations. In this connection, I would like to quote a statement of the delegate of Ceylon made after Israel had announced its intention to withdraw:

I, as a humble representative of a small nation, would like to pay my tribute to the Government of the United States of America for creating a set of circumstances which enabled the withdrawal of Israel troops. It is, in my opinion, a very useful act in the solution of the troubles before us.

United States Position on Gaza and Sharm el-Sheikh

The United States position on the Middle East problem has been made clear in various public documents beginning with the February 11 aide memoire.⁴ During the long weeks in which the Assembly has been occupied with the Middle East, we have sought a solution which would be based on justice and which would take account of the legitimate interests of all parties. On March 1 Israel announced that it had decided to make full and prompt withdrawal behind the armistice lines in accordance with the General Assembly's resolution of February 2, 1957.

In the course of this announcement, the Foreign

Minister of Israel made certain declarations which, for the most part, constituted restatements of what had been said in the General Assembly or by the Secretary-General in his reports, or hopes and expectations which seemed to the United States not unreasonable in the light of prior actions of the Assembly.

On March 1, Ambassador Lodge, speaking for the United States in the General Assembly,⁵ took note of the statement of the Secretary-General of February 22d in which he reported Egypt's readiness and willingness to make special and helpful arrangements in Gaza with the United Nations and some of its auxiliary bodies. In this connection, Ambassador Lodge said:

Obviously these matters are not for the United States alone to decide, but the United States can, I think, properly entertain the hope that such a useful role for the United Nations and its appropriate subsidiary bodies as the Secretary-General has described could usefully continue until there is a definitive settlement respecting the Gaza Strip or some final general agreement between the parties.

With respect to the area along the Gulf of Aqaba and the Straits of Tiran, the United States position remains as stated in Ambassador Lodge's speech:

It is essential that units of the United Nations Emergency Force be stationed at the Straits of Tiran in order to achieve there the separation of Egyptian and Israeli land and sea forces. This separation is essential until it is clear that the nonexercise of any claimed belligerent rights has established in practice the peaceful conditions which must govern navigation in waters having such an international interest. All of this would, of course, be without prejudice to any ultimate determination which may be made of any legal questions concerning the Gulf of Aqaba.

Since then developments in Gaza have moved rapidly. We have kept in close touch with Secretary-General Hammarskjold and with various members of the United Nations. Just yesterday Mrs. Meir, Foreign Minister of Israel, called at the Department of State to express her "deep concern at the return of Egypt to Gaza, the re-establishment of its control therein and the reduction of the responsibilities of the United Nations in the Gaza area."⁶ Mrs. Meir pointed out that Israel viewed this situation as contrary to the assumptions and expectations expressed by her and

⁴ *Ibid.*, Mar. 11, 1957, p. 392.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Mar. 18, 1957, p. 431.

⁶ See p. 562.

others in the United Nations on March 1 and subsequently. She also expressed her anxiety at reports and statements envisaging restrictions against Israeli shipping in the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba and the maintenance of belligerency by Egypt.

Secretary Dulles reaffirmed that the United States policy continued to be as expressed in the speech of Ambassador Lodge in the General Assembly on March 1 and in the President's letter of March 2 to Prime Minister Ben-Gurion.⁷ The Secretary reaffirmed "that the United States would continue to use its influence in seeking the objectives of peace and tranquillity and the avoidance of any situation which would negate the great efforts which had been made by the world community to settle the current disputes in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter." The United States stands firmly by the hopes and expectations it had expressed with respect to (1) the exercise of the responsibility of the United Nations in Gaza, (2) the free and innocent passage of the Straits of Tiran by the ships of all nations in accordance with international law, and (3) the settlement of the Suez Canal problem in accordance with the six principles adopted by the Security Council and accepted by Egypt.⁸

This Government will use its influence in every appropriate way to assist the Secretary-General and the parties concerned to carry out the recommendations of the Assembly and to create peaceful conditions in the area.

Very critical times remain with us. We have made progress along the road toward our objectives in the Middle East, but the road ahead is long and difficult.

Our objectives have not changed. Through the United Nations there have been accomplished a cease-fire and the withdrawal of forces, and the clearance of the Suez Canal has almost been completed. Immediately before us is the necessity for agreeing on interim arrangements for use of the canal and moving on to solution of the basic problems which gave rise to the present crisis. It is not sufficient to put out the fire; we must prevent it from breaking out again.

Getting at and removing the root causes is a formidable task. It is more than enough to

challenge the patience of a Job and the wisdom of a Solomon. But can anyone seriously believe that a lasting peace will be possible so long as the boundaries between Israel and her neighbors remain unsettled and a feeling of insecurity pervades the entire area? Can we hope to avoid serious difficulties in the future unless real progress is made toward the solution of the refugee problem and the development of the area's natural resources?

The solutions to these problems are as difficult as they are necessary. To find them, the United States is determined to continue to use every appropriate means both within and without the United Nations. In the process, we shall be serving the cause of peace with justice everywhere.

Enlarged United Nations Membership

I would like now to turn briefly to a development in the United Nations of great public interest. That is the recent rapid increase in the size of United Nations membership—especially from Asia, Africa, and the Middle East. This reflects one of the great phenomena of the postwar period. In 12 years some 600 million people from this area have gained self-government or independence.

The United Nations is open for membership to all peace-loving countries able and willing to carry out the obligations of the charter. The United States favors, within this definition, a United Nations as broadly representative as possible.

A United Nations that has grown in less than 2 years from 60 to 81 members and in which the Afro-Asian states now constitute more than a third of the total presents new problems and, I think, new opportunities. I do not believe that it is necessarily cause for alarm.

Those who are concerned point to the fact that the Assembly rather than the Security Council has become the voice of the United Nations and its most influential body. The relative strength of the Latin American States has been reduced. The conflict over so-called colonial problems has been sharpened. With the recent increase in membership the Afro-Asian nations alone, if they stood together, could no doubt prevent the passage of any important resolution.

This situation requires careful consideration. In actuality, aside from the U.S.S.R. and its satellites, these blocs do not often vote as an entity. We think of Afro-Asia as a unit. In fact, it is

⁷ BULLETIN of Mar. 18, 1957, p. 433.

⁸ *Ibid.*, Nov. 12, 1956, p. 754.

extremely diverse and contains subblocs of an ethnic, religious, or political nature.

On certain fundamental issues the Afro-Asian nations do stand very solidly together. I refer particularly to colonialism and economic development. On these issues they are often joined by the so-called Latin American bloc.

The fact is that the people of the world, regardless of their military or economic strength, want an increasing voice in world affairs. In the United Nations, and especially in the Assembly, they find this voice. The traditionally great powers of the West, whose greater economic and military strength gives them a preponderance of authority and responsibility, must heed this voice if they desire wide support for their policies and actions. They do not have to heed it, of course, and the Assembly cannot enforce its recommendations on other members.

In my opinion, what is required of United Nations members in the enlarged General Assembly, where each state has one vote, is a special sense of responsibility. The smaller and underdeveloped countries do have a collective power far out of proportion to their economic, military, and political strength. If they abuse this power, the General Assembly can become a center of contention and deadlock. On the other hand, the great powers, if their cause is just, should not lack the support of the majority of the General Assembly on important issues.

I believe, if we examine the record, that the performance of the 11th General Assembly reflected in general this sense of responsibility of which I speak. On the Algerian question, for example, two Asian states, Japan and Thailand, played a leading role in developing a procedural-type resolution which avoided exacerbating the situation.⁹ This was an excellent example of Assembly moderation and restraint. On the Cyprus

question, the General Assembly avoided prejudicing any substantive solution by adopting a simple resolution which has helped maintain an atmosphere reasonably conducive to future negotiations.¹⁰ Here, too, an Asian state, India, was able to work out a compromise resolution generally acceptable to those principally concerned.

In conclusion, I should like to quote from an editorial in a recent issue of your magazine, *Council Woman*:

One thing is certain. The United Nations is the one solid hope of humanity for a peaceful and better world; and the United States can and must be its strongest supporter.

If the nations of the world had been compelled to live the past 12 years without a common meeting place, without basic rules by which nations should conduct themselves, without machinery for the peaceful settlement of their differences, without a place to air disputes and seek agreements—then it is my opinion that the world might not have survived those 12 years. The stresses and strains have been so great, the ideological conflict so sharp, and the destructive power of the weapons available so immense that without the unifying power of the United Nations we could have, by this time, destroyed ourselves.

If the United Nations is indeed the one best hope we have for peace with justice, it is only common sense to use it as the cornerstone for a sound, creative foreign policy. This does not mean that the United Nations dictates foreign policy to us or any other country. But enlightened self-interest dictates that we bend every effort to make the United Nations serve with increasing effectiveness the common desires of mankind for a world in which "Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness" are not only possible but attainable.

⁹ *Ibid.*, Mar. 11, 1957, p. 423.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, Mar. 25, 1957, p. 508.

United States and United Kingdom Exchange Views at Bermuda Meeting

Following is the text of a joint communique with annexes issued at Tucker's Town, Bermuda, on March 24 by President Eisenhower and British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan at the close of a 3-day meeting, March 21 to 24 (White House press release dated March 24).

The President of the United States and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, assisted by the United States Secretary of State and the British Foreign Secretary and other advisers, have exchanged views during the past three days on many subjects of mutual concern. They have conducted their discussions with the freedom and frankness permitted to old friends. In a world of growing interdependence they recognize their responsibility to seek to coordinate their foreign policies in the interests of peace with justice.

Among the subjects discussed in detail were common problems concerning the Middle East, Far East, NATO, European Cooperation, the reunification of Germany, and Defense.

The President and the Prime Minister are well satisfied with the results of this Conference, at which a number of decisions have been taken. They intend to continue the exchange of views so well begun.

The agreements and conclusions reached on the main subjects discussed at the Conference are annexed.

ANNEX I

1. Recognition of the value of collective security pacts within the framework of the United Nations, and the special importance of NATO for both countries as the cornerstone of their policy in the West.

2. Reaffirmation of common interest in the development of European unity within the Atlantic Community.

3. Agreement on the importance of closer association of the United Kingdom with Europe.

4. Agreement on the benefits likely to accrue for European and world trade from the plans for the common market and the Free Trade Area, provided they do not lead to a high tariff bloc; and on the desirability that all countries should pursue liberal trade policies.

5. Willingness of the United States, under authority of the recent Middle East joint resolution, to participate actively in the work of the Military Committee of the Baghdad Pact.

6. Reaffirmation of intention to support the right of the German people to early reunification in peace and freedom.

7. Sympathy for the people of Hungary; condemnation of repressive Soviet policies towards the peoples of Eastern Europe, and of Soviet defiance of relevant United Nations resolutions.

8. Agreement on the need for the speedy implementation of recent resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly dealing with the Gaza Strip and the Gulf of Aqaba.

9. Agreement on the importance of compliance both in letter and in spirit with the Security Council Resolution of October 13 concerning the Suez Canal, and on support for the efforts of the Secretary-General to bring about a settlement in accordance with its provisions.

10. Joint declaration on policy regarding nuclear tests (See Annex II).

11. Agreement in principle that, in the interest of mutual defense and mutual economy, certain guided missiles will be made available by the United States for use by British forces.

ANNEX II

1. For a long time our two Governments have been attempting to negotiate with the Soviet Union under the auspices of the United Nations Disarmament Commission an effective agreement for comprehensive disarmament. We are continuing to seek such an agreement in the current disarmament discussions in London. In the absence of such an agreement the security of the free world must continue to depend to a marked degree upon the nuclear deterrent. To maintain this effectively, continued nuclear testing is required, certainly for the present.

2. We recognize, however, that there is sincere concern that continued nuclear testing may increase world radiation to levels which might be harmful. Studies by independent scientific organizations confirm our belief that this will not happen so long as testing is continued with due restraint. Moreover, the testing program has demonstrated the feasibility of greatly reducing worldwide fallout from large nuclear explosions.

3. Over the past months our Governments have considered various proposed methods of limiting tests. We have now concluded together that in the absence of more general nuclear control agreements of the kind which we have been and are seeking, a test limitation agreement could not today be effectively enforced for technical reasons; nor could breaches of it be surely detected. We believe nevertheless that even before a general agreement is reached self-imposed restraint can and should be exercised by nations which conduct tests.

4. Therefore, on behalf of our two Governments, we declare our intention to continue to conduct nuclear tests only in such manner as will keep world radiation from rising to more than a small fraction of the levels that might be hazardous. We look to the Soviet Union to exercise a similar restraint.

5. We shall continue our general practice of publicly announcing our test series well in advance of their occurrence with information as to their location and general timing. We would be willing to register with the United Nations advance notice of our intention to conduct future nuclear tests and to permit limited international observation of such tests if the Soviet Union would do the same.

Meeting Between Secretary Dulles and Israeli Foreign Minister

Following is the text of an agreed statement released on March 18 (press release 155) following a meeting between Secretary Dulles and Israeli Foreign Minister Golda Meir.

Israeli Foreign Minister Meir discussed with Secretary Dulles today various aspects of the present situation in the Middle East, particularly developments in the Gaza Strip following Israeli withdrawal in accordance with the United Nations resolutions.

Mrs. Meir expressed her deep concern at the return of Egypt to Gaza, the re-establishment of its control therein and the reduction of the responsibilities of the United Nations in the Gaza area. The Foreign Minister of Israel pointed out the gravity with which Israel viewed this situation and emphasized that it was contrary to the assumption and expectations expressed by her and others in the United Nations on March 1 and subsequently. She also expressed her anxiety at reports and statements envisaging restrictions against Israeli shipping in the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba, and the maintenance of bellicosity by Egypt.

Secretary Dulles reaffirmed that the U.S. policy with respect to these matters continued to be as publicly expressed, notably in the speech of Ambassador Lodge in the United Nations General Assembly on March 1 and in the President's letter of March 2 to Prime Minister Ben-Gurion.¹ The Secretary said that the United States was concerned with current developments and was in close touch with U.N. Secretary General Hammarskjold and other members of the U.N. He said that the United States would continue to use its influence in seeking the objectives of peace and tranquillity and the avoidance of any situation which would negate the great efforts which had been made by the world community to settle the current disputes in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter. The United States, the Secretary said, stood firmly by the hopes and expectations it had expressed with regard to the situation which should prevail in the area with respect to the exercise of the responsi-

¹ BULLETIN of Mar. 18, 1957, p. 431.

bility of the United Nations in Gaza, the free and innocent passage of the Straits of Tiran by the ships of all nations in accordance with international law, and the settlement of the Suez Canal problem in accordance with the Six Principles adopted by the Security Council and accepted by Egypt.²

A common readiness was expressed for continued consultation on these matters.

Death of President Magsaysay of the Philippines

Statement by President Eisenhower

White House (on board the U.S.S. *Canberra*) press release dated March 17.

In the tragic death of President Magsaysay, the people of the Philippine Republic, as well as those of the United States and the entire free world, have lost a valiant champion of freedom.¹ I had been looking forward to meeting with President Magsaysay in Washington, to reaffirm the close and affectionate ties all Americans have with his people.

A stanch advocate of independence for his people, President Magsaysay was also an active and determined fighter against communism. He will be greatly missed.

Mrs. Eisenhower and I extend to his family not only our personal sympathies but also the heartfelt sympathies of all Americans, who have lost a good friend.

Statement by Secretary Dulles

Press release 154 dated March 18

The tragedy that claimed the life of President Magsaysay came as a grievous shock. I am sure all Americans join me in extending to our close friends of the Philippines our heartfelt condolences in the loss of their beloved President.

President Magsaysay was a great Philippine leader and an enlightened champion of the welfare of his people. He also provided a glorious example to the whole of Asia, and indeed to the world, of wisdom, courage, and success in overcoming the Communist menace.

¹*Ibid.*, Oct. 22, 1956, p. 616.

²President Ramon Magsaysay was killed in the crash of an airliner on Cebu Island on Mar. 17.

In the death of President Magsaysay there has been lost to the Philippine people a noble leader, to the American people a true friend, and to the world a stalwart champion and exponent of the right of peoples to governments of their own choosing and to basic human freedoms.

Anniversary of Establishment of Pakistan as Republic

Press release 172 dated March 23

Following is the text of a message sent by President Eisenhower to the President of Pakistan on March 23 on the occasion of the first anniversary of the establishment of Pakistan as a Republic.

His Excellency

ISKANDER MIRZA

President of Pakistan

Karachi

I take great pleasure in extending to you and to the people of Pakistan warmest greetings and best wishes from the people of the United States on the first anniversary of the establishment of Pakistan as a Republic.

Pakistan has proved to the world again that a free people, with resolute faith and enduring courage, working together in a common cause, can surmount the many difficulties that inevitably face a new nation. You have made commendable progress since independence. I am confident that even greater achievements lie ahead.

The United States values its close and cordial ties with Pakistan. This anniversary affords me a welcome opportunity to reaffirm the importance I attach to the warm friendship between our two countries. I have every reason to believe that as free, independent democracies dedicated to the basic principles of peace and justice our two countries can look forward to ever closer friendship in the years ahead.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

New U. S. Member Assumes Duties on Iraq Development Board

Press release 167 dated March 21

The U.S. member of the Iraq Development Board, Clifford Willson, has arrived at Baghdad to take up his duties on the board. He suc-

ceeds Wesley R. Nelson, who served for 4 years as the U.S. member.

Mr. Willson's arrival at Baghdad will make it possible for him to participate in the observance of Iraq Development Week, which begins on March 23.

In providing a member for the Development Board, the United States has taken note of the vigorous strides which Iraq is making toward improvement of the living standards of all its people. Iraq's farsighted economic development program, supported by wise and intelligent use of revenues from its own resources, stands as an inspiration to other newly developing countries. It has been a source of gratification to the Government of the United States to be associated with Iraq in co-operative efforts to make the most effective use of available resources in redeveloping the historic lands of the Tigris and Euphrates. The several major projects to be dedicated during Development Week testify to the very real benefits to the people of Iraq of this progressive program and of the cooperative spirit which animates it.

Inter-American Highway Nearing Completion

Press release 156 dated March 18

The awarding on March 15 of a contract for grading a 17-mile impassable section of the Inter-American Highway between Concepción, Panama, and the Costa Rican border initiated the first step in closing the last remaining roadway gap between the United States and the Canal Zone. The event marks the near approach to completion of an undertaking of the United States in cooperation with Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Panama begun in 1934.

Impetus was given the Inter-American Highway program in 1955 when President Eisenhower recommended that sufficient funds be provided for financial and technical assistance to complete the project at the earliest possible date.¹ As a result,

¹ For text of the President's letters to the Congress dated Apr. 1, 1955, on the need for accelerating completion of the highway, together with a map of the Inter-American Highway, see BULLETIN of Apr. 11, 1955, p. 595.

Congress, in the summer of 1955, appropriated \$62,980,000. Rapid progress has been made since that time. The original agreements with the respective governments were negotiated by the Department of State, and engineering supervision and fiscal accountability for U.S. funds have been provided by the Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of Commerce. The United States is paying two-thirds of the cost of projects, and one-third is paid by the country in which the work is located.

Of the 1,600 miles of the highway lying between the southern border of Mexico and the Panama Canal, there remained, as of July 1955, 1,080 miles upon which improvement of some type was required to bring the highway to an acceptable standard for normal year-round travel. Within this unimproved mileage, there was a total of 173 miles where no passable highway existed. This total was made up of 25 miles just south of the Mexican border in Guatemala, 131 miles in southern Costa Rica, and the 17-mile section in northern Panama now to be begun. Awarding of a contract for this section in Panama places all impassable sections under construction. In addition, 490 miles of low-standard road are being improved. Much work remains to be done, including necessary improvements on an additional 370 miles. Many bridges are yet to be built, and some 1,000 miles of road will require final asphalt pavement.

The present dry season which began in December will see the greatest construction activity on the highway since its start. The last of the impassable sections is now under contract, and some time in 1957 it should be possible to drive over all-weather or paved roads from the United States to San Isidro, Costa Rica, a distance of 2,725 miles. By the end of 1958 it may be possible to drive over the entire length of the highway to the Panama Canal.

Tourist travel over the Inter-American Highway has already brought great benefits to the economy of Mexico. By 1959 other Central American countries should benefit also. Feeder roads connecting now inaccessible areas with the main artery are expected to develop rapidly with a marked increase in domestic and foreign trade.

U.S. Contribution To Help Fight Malaria in American Republics

Press release 119 dated March 7

Milton S. Eisenhower, President Eisenhower's representative on the Inter-American Committee of Presidential Representatives, presented a check for \$1,500,000 on March 7 to Dr. Fred L. Soper, Director of the Pan American Sanitary Bureau, as a contribution from the U.S. Government toward malaria eradication in the other American Republics.

The ceremony took place in the Pan American Union building in the office of José A. Mora, Secretary General of the Organization of American States. John B. Hollister, Director of the International Cooperation Administration; Dr. LeRoy E. Burney, Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and John C. Dreier, Ambassador of the United States to the Organization of American States, were among those attending the ceremony. Following are the texts of remarks made by Dr. Eisenhower, Dr. Mora, and Dr. Soper.

Remarks by Dr. Eisenhower

Mr. Secretary General, Dr. Soper, and Gentlemen: I am very happy to be able to participate in this ceremony this morning. We have gathered in the Pan American Union in recognition of the vital role that the Organization of American States is playing in efforts to advance human well-being and social progress in this hemisphere.

Historically, malaria has been a major foe of economic and social progress for the American Republics. It is still a scourge in many areas, affecting either directly or indirectly every individual on the continent. Experience indicates that malaria can be conquered with new weapons which are now available. The Pan American Sanitary Organization has played a leading part in their development and use. Malaria has been eradicated from several countries, including the United States. We all share an eagerness that it be eradicated with all possible speed from countries where it still exists.

Great interest has been expressed by the Inter-American Committee of Presidential Representatives in the role of the Organization of American

States in supporting programs for the eradication of disease from the continent. It was my privilege to announce to the members of this Committee at its first meeting last September that the United States was going to make a special contribution to the malaria eradication fund of the Pan American Sanitary Organization. This offer was subsequently made formally by the acting United States representative at a meeting of the Directing Council of the Sanitary Organization and is now being implemented by a grant from the International Cooperation Administration. In presenting this check for \$1,500,000, I hope that this expression of United States interest and the splendid efforts which are being made by so many countries will hasten the attainment of this great humanitarian goal of malaria eradication.

Remarks by Dr. Mora

I wish to express on behalf of the Organization of American States and of the people of the American Republics the most profound appreciation for this most generous contribution of the Government of the United States to the solution of what has been characterized as the most urgent health problem in the Americas, the eradication of malaria.

Dr. Eisenhower, may I express to you and through you to the Government of the United States our deepest appreciation for this renewed demonstration of support for inter-American programs which contribute to the advancement of human welfare of all the people of the Americas.

I now turn this contribution over to Dr. Soper, Director of the Pan American Sanitary Bureau, our inter-American specialized organization in the field of public health.

Remarks by Dr. Soper

Mr. Secretary General, Dr. Eisenhower, and Gentlemen: It is with a sense of profound gratitude that I accept on behalf of the Pan American Sanitary Organization this contribution by the United States Government to the campaign to eradicate malaria from this hemisphere.

Malaria is still a leading cause of death in many parts of the world, including some areas in the Americas. Its continued existence anywhere in this hemisphere threatens reinfection in all areas where malaria has been eradicated.

Science has given us a powerful new weapon in the residual insecticides such as DDT, which make the eradication of malaria possible and practicable throughout the Americas. But there is also a deadline we must meet, since mosquitoes eventually develop resistance to these insecticides. If we move too slowly, the job becomes vastly more difficult and costly. This is why we have given first priority to the malaria eradication program. The Pan American Sanitary Organization is urging governments to expand and accelerate their national eradication programs.

There has been an excellent response, and many governments are expecting our Bureau to give them greater administrative and professional col-

laboration in furtherance of their eradication programs. These demands have far exceeded our means, and we have been forced to seek additional resources.

And that is why, Dr. Eisenhower, we appreciate so much this timely contribution from the United States Government. It will enable us to move ahead more rapidly in all the territories of the Americas where malaria continues to exist.

On behalf of the Pan American Sanitary Organization I express our heartfelt appreciation for this generous contribution. It is an added demonstration of solidarity in our campaign to eliminate malaria from our shores.

Amending the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948

*Statement by E. Allan Lightner, Jr.
Acting Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs¹*

It is a privilege to appear before this committee in support of certain amendments to the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, sometimes referred to as the Smith-Mundt Act.

Role of Office of Public Affairs

When this act was passed in 1948, all of its functions were placed in the Department of State under the general direction of the Office of Public Affairs. With the establishment of the United States Information Agency, and the transfer of information activities to that Agency, the Department retained two important functions in connection with this act:

(1) the supervision of the noninformation functions authorized by the Smith-Mundt Act; and

(2) foreign-policy guidance to the United States Information Agency.

The principal noninformation function provided by this act is the educational exchange program conducted by the International Educational Exchange Service of the Department under the general supervision of the Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs. The Secretary of State is also responsible for certain exchanges of personnel carried out by the International Cooperation Administration in connection with its technical assistance program.

My comments are principally concerned with the amendments pertaining to the responsibilities of the Department of State in conducting the educational exchange program. I can also assure you that the Department favors the amendments dealing with the information program.

When this act was originally passed, the House Foreign Affairs Committee was literally pioneering in a new field. It is really quite remarkable

¹ Made before the Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on Mar. 13 (press release 143).

that during the intervening years no major amendments have been required in the act. This certainly illustrates the care and foresight of those who sponsored and enacted the original legislation.

Only recently has it become apparent, as a result of the cumulative experience in administering this increasingly complicated program over the years, that certain amendments to this act of 1948 are needed.

Before explaining these changes, a brief review of the scope of the International Educational Exchange Program and the relationship between the Smith-Mundt and Fulbright parts of it may be of interest.

Scope of Educational Exchange Activities

The authority for the annual appropriations for all of the activities of the International Educational Exchange Service of the Department is derived from the Smith-Mundt Act. This act is also the authority under which the Department requests the appropriated foreign currencies provided for under the Fulbright Act (Public Law 584, 79th Congress). Included in the authorized activities are the following:

(1) the operation of the various educational exchange programs, including the exchange of persons, their orientation and followup;

(2) the program of assistance to American-sponsored schools in Latin America;

(3) the approval and facilitation of hundreds of privately sponsored exchange programs designated as exchange-visitor programs and involving the bringing of thousands of persons to the United States;

(4) assistance to other private programs involving the exchange of persons between the United States and other countries;

(5) the responsibilities of the Secretary of State for participation in cultural conventions and other cultural activities between the United States and other countries and the backstopping of such international cultural activities as those conducted by the Cultural Council of the Organization of American States, North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, etc.; and

(6) the coordination of these exchange and cultural activities into a combined effort to insure

their maximum effectiveness in our foreign relations programs.

Relationship Between the Smith-Mundt and Fulbright Programs

The Smith-Mundt Act authorizes dollar appropriations for reciprocal exchanges on a worldwide basis. For example, in 1958 we plan to conduct programs under this act with 87 countries. Programs under the Fulbright Act, on the other hand, are restricted to countries with which we have specific Executive agreements that make available nonconvertible foreign currencies for this purpose. It is anticipated we will have such agreements with some 33 countries in 1958. Another limitation on Fulbright funds is their use in connection with schools and institutions of higher learning here and abroad. They could not be used to bring foreign leaders here on short visits or for other programs that are not strictly in the educational field. The fact that the Fulbright funds are available only in nonconvertible foreign currencies is another limitation. They can be used only for expenses within the participating foreign countries and for international travel.

In practice, this means that the program under the Fulbright Act has to have a certain amount of dollar support to supplement the foreign currencies provided. This works out at the ratio of about \$1 in U.S. currency for every \$2 in foreign currencies. The dollar currencies are used for expenses of foreign participants while they are in the United States and for the dollar costs of the stateside and overseas services required to carry out the program. I refer here to appropriated dollars. In addition to these cash outlays, maximum use is made of private scholarships and assistance from other private sources. The total value of such private financial support is a major factor in the success of the Fulbright program, as it approximates the amount of foreign currency expended each year.

I believe you will see from the foregoing that a joint operation of these two types of programs in countries where both are authorized is a necessity. We are constantly seeking to effect a closer integration, and, in fact, one of the amendments we are now proposing (section 5) is designed to bring about still further coordination between these two programs.

Estimated Cost of Amendments

The estimated annual cost to the Department of all these amendments will be approximately \$320,000. However, in our judgment, the improvement in program effectiveness will more than offset this amount. The Department will not request additional funds for fiscal year 1958 for these purposes but will reprogram its regular funds to cover any additional costs.

Changes Between Present Bill and S.3638 Considered Last Year

The bill you are now considering differs in some respects from the one the committee considered last year. Some of the changes are editorial in nature; others represent changes in substance or the adding of safeguarding provisions in compliance with comments or suggestions of the committee during the hearings last year. These will be noted as the particular provisions are discussed.

Development of Projects

Section 1 is for the purpose of authorizing our assistance to such projects as chairs of American studies at institutions abroad and the holding of short seminars or workshops on various branches of American studies.

The chairs in American studies would be filled by American professors or American-trained professors. We have found that projects of this nature engender binational support and produce a greater cumulative effect than can be gained from single isolated exchanges.

This provision would also permit us to arrange for special seminars and workshops abroad. Such meetings would bring together groups of American lecturers and researchers, already abroad under this program or the Fulbright program, for the purpose of presenting an intensive course on particular phases of American life and institutions.

These special seminars or conferences would be attended by foreign nationals who had been exchange visitors under the program, as well as some foreign nationals who had not had such an experience. For the former, this would be a "refresher" or "followup" session that would keep alive and fresh in their minds their American experience and would update or expand their knowledge of our country. Such sessions should also make a real impact on participants who have never

been to the United States, giving them an insight into American studies and American educational techniques. For example, a group of foreign high school teachers of American history or English could attend such sessions, even though they might not be able to come to this country under this program. The cost, of course, would be much less than if we brought them to this country.

Orientation for Non-U.S.-Government Students

Section 2 (a) authorizes orientation courses and materials for exchangees who are not financed under the Government program. We now give orientation to our own grantees. This would enable us to do the same, on a very selective basis, for exchangees in nongovernmental programs similar to ours.

We have in mind particularly the orientation of foreign students participating in privately sponsored programs conducted by the Institute of International Education. The standards used in selecting these students are basically the same as those for Government grantees, with our embassies abroad assisting in the screening and selection.

Orientation usually consists of a 6-week academic program at selected colleges and universities, or a 4-week visit in the homes of individual American families under a program supervised by the Experiment in International Living.

The wording of this provision as compared with that submitted last year has been tightened up to assure that the orientation will be limited to the types of programs the Government operates and to those instances where we can determine that such orientation will better equip the exchangee to further the objectives of this act.

Third-Country Exchanges

Section 2 (b) would permit nationals of a co-operating country to attend selected institutions in other cooperating countries and to participate in meetings held in such other countries. Grants under this provision would be awarded solely for the purpose of studying subjects pertaining to the United States and then only when it is determined that urgent foreign-relations objectives will be served.

Authority now exists in the Fulbright Act for sending nationals of countries participating in that program to American institutions abroad, such as Robert College in Turkey. As already

in-
edu-
of for-
try or
ough
country
would
to this

ents
s and
anced
give
d en-
basis,
s sim-

on of
spon-
te of
ed in
ne as
sses-
n.

aca-
versi-
idual
ed by

pared
tened
ed to
rates
mine
e ex-

a co-
tions
ate in
rants
y for
o the
ained
ll be

rt for
g in
road,
eady

letin

mentioned, the Fulbright program is limited to about 30 countries and therefore does not meet all the urgent needs in this field.

We have in mind, for example, projects for bringing together nationals of Lebanon and surrounding countries to take courses under American professors at the American University in Beirut. Also nationals of Asiatic countries could be brought to the University of the Philippines or the University of Taiwan to take intensive courses in American literature, American history, etc., under American professors and American-trained professors. Such arrangements would also broaden the audience, especially in terms of reaching different nationality groups, for American professors already assigned to certain of these countries and thus add to their effectiveness.

Two slight changes in the previous language have been made in the wording of this provision. The first would permit the participation in meetings held in places other than selected institutions and places of study. It could include an auditorium or other such public place. The other change makes it clear that this activity will not be undertaken in any country controlled by international communism. I can assure you also that institutions will be selected solely on the basis of our assurance of their desire and ability to promote ideas and principles in keeping with our basic foreign-policy objectives.

Advisory Commission Membership

The first item of *Section 3* will make officers of State universities and land-grant colleges eligible to serve on the U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange. The present wording of the act makes the holder of any compensated Federal or State office ineligible. It is our understanding that this was not intended to disqualify officers of educational institutions, but it has this effect in some States. We believe that all such persons should be eligible for consideration for membership on this commission.

Annual Report by U.S. Advisory Commission to Congress

Section 4 amends the present law to require reporting by the U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange to Congress on an annual rather than a semiannual basis. More frequent reporting was desirable in the earlier days of the

program, but the commission and we believe that an annual report will not only be sufficient but also that it will be more meaningful to the Congress. The exchange program is planned and operated on an annual basis. Thus, an annual report will cover a logical program period. Should any situation arise which would make an interim report desirable, such a report could be presented on the initiative of the commission, or at our request, or at the request of the Congress.

Use of Binational Commissions

Section 5 authorizes the use of existing binational commissions and foundations abroad in the administration of the program. These commissions are created under the Fulbright Act for the purpose of administering that program in each country. Their use in connection with the Smith-Mundt program will add a binational element that has proved most effective in the Fulbright program and will facilitate the joint administration of the combined programs.

No dollars are now available for these commissions. Under the proposed arrangement a very limited amount of dollars would be made available, primarily for payment of a portion of the salary of the key American officer.

This provision differs from the proposal of last year in that no authority is requested to create additional commissions. We plan to use only those established under the Fulbright Act, since one of the principal purposes is to coordinate the two programs.

Advice From Private Groups

Section 6 amends section 801(6) of the act in two respects:

First, it authorizes the calling of meetings to obtain advice and assistance of private and public educational institutions and other similar organizations. This would permit better cooperation between governmental and nongovernmental exchange programs so that the effectiveness of both would be increased. Persons attending such meetings at the invitation of the Government would not require full field investigations of the kind conducted for persons employed or assigned to duty. Such investigations are not considered necessary since the persons attending would serve in advisory capacities only and would not have access to classified material.

There is general authority now (section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946, 5 U.S.C. 55a) under which individuals may be appointed and brought in for consultation and advice, but specific authority as a part of this act would be extremely helpful in attracting the type of individuals needed for this program.

There is authority now for creating advisory committees. The meetings contemplated under this additional authority, however, will be generally on a short-term basis, and we do not believe we should formally create a committee just for these purposes.

An editorial change has been made in this provision to eliminate unnecessary language.

\$15.00 Per Diem for Commission Members

Second, *Section 6* authorizes an increase from \$10.00 to \$15.00 in the per-diem rates payable to members of advisory commissions and committees. Such persons serve without compensation. The \$15.00 rate conforms to the general rate now prescribed for consultants and others serving without compensation. The authority requested would bring these commission and committee members under the general legislation prescribing rates of per diem for experts and consultants serving the Government without compensation.

Emergency Medical Expenses

Section 7 includes an item (identified as subsection 5) which authorizes the payment of emergency medical expenses for persons selected to participate in the program. The lack of authority to pay such expenses in emergency cases has given rise to serious problems. Foreign participants are really guests of this Government while in this country, and the inability of the Government to meet their emergency hospital and medical expenses, which the individuals often are unable to meet, places them and the Government in an embarrassing position. Similar problems arise in the case of American participants abroad. Authority is requested also to pay the expense of travel incurred by reason of illness. In a number of instances participants in the program have suffered mental or physical disorders that require their return home accompanied by an attendant. The proposed provision would permit payment of travel costs incurred under such circumstances. This authority is urgently needed to meet emer-

gency situations as they arise. The number of such emergencies, fortunately, has been very small.

Facilitating Exchanges of International Organizations

Section 8 amends section 902 of the act to permit the acceptance of funds from international organizations for operation of programs authorized by the act. Authority now exists for the acceptance of such funds from foreign governments. The additional authority is needed to permit this Government to accept funds for use in administering some of the fellowship programs of the United Nations. The funds would be accepted and used for only those specific projects for which they are made available by such organizations. Our Government is dedicated to a policy of cooperation with the United Nations. Lack of authority to accept funds offered by this organization for the training of foreign nationals in the United States under its programs has proved a source of embarrassment to our Government. This amendment would permit the desired co-operation.

The section differs from the one proposed last year in a matter of language only. There is no change in its substance.

Annual Report by Secretary of State

Section 9 proposes a change in section 1008 which would permit the Secretary of State to report to the Congress on the educational exchange program annually. He is now required to report semiannually. Since a year is required to meet a complete cycle of the exchange program, reports presented on that basis would be more complete and more meaningful.

Settlement of Tort Claims

Section 10 includes authority to settle tort claims arising abroad by both the Department and the U.S. Information Agency. The expeditious settlement of equitable claims will aid immeasurably in maintaining and promoting friendly relations abroad.

This will enable the Department and the U.S. Information Agency to settle all claims arising out of their overseas operations on a basis similar to that used by the armed services. A uniform basis for settlement of such claims is highly desirable.

Effectiveness of Educational and Cultural Exchange Programs

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the attention the committee has given to this rather detailed explanation. We are convinced that these amendments to the act of 1948 will enable the Depart-

ment to improve the administration of the educational exchange program. That program has become such a valuable instrument in the pursuance of our foreign-policy goals that I am sure you will look with favor on anything we can do to make it still more effective.

The Cold War and the Universities

by *Frederick Cable Oechsner*

American universities are helping this country with ideas and personnel to fight communism on every cold-war battlefield in the world. Even if the cold war as we know it today should last for 50 years or more, the universities are directly contributing to shaping a world of the future where we may enjoy genuine peaceful coexistence instead of the uncertain substitute for it with which we are struggling today. Hungary and Egypt, and before them Korea, Formosa, and Indochina, have shown us how far we still have to go.

One encouraging thought to sustain us, in the midst of disturbing news from satellite Europe and the Middle East, is that, while man in his million-year history has had many periods of irrational and antisocial behavior, there has never been a time when he made such an intense, methodical, and intelligent attempt to understand and improve his behavior as at present.

Never before have we had the instruments that we have today for studying man in the matrix of his particular culture—whether he be American, Russian, Egyptian, or Israeli—and the way in which his behavior and culture relate to other individuals and groups in the world. And never before, incidentally, have we had the very real incentive of possible annihilation to spur us on.

In discussing the role of universities in the cold war, I use the latter term to describe the period since the end of World War II, a period of intense political, economic, and psychological as well as

military pressures, a period in which we find literally dozens of great cultural groups, each with its own cherished pattern of behavior, locked in a struggle for power and prestige.

Almost nothing seems more important to me in the working out of our cold-war problems than the actual movement of persons to one another's countries. I refer not only to the coming of delegates to the United Nations and other international conferences but also to the interchange of experience involved in the visits of educators, lecturers, labor leaders, doctors, lawyers, engineers, students, scientists, and artists and also of groups like orchestras, theater companies, and athletic teams. I was greatly surprised, a year or two ago, to see a young American girl broadcasting in Serbo-Croat from the Zagreb radio station to Yugoslav young people. She had studied the language at Smith College and had been sent overseas under the Department of State's international educational exchange program.

Six thousand others like her this year, both

• *Mr. Oechsner is principal officer of the U.S. consulate at Monterrey, Mexico. His article is based on an address which he made at Tulane University, New Orleans, La., on November 10, 1956, during a temporary assignment in the United States.*

American and foreign, will cross the oceans to and from United States universities under this program, at a cost of \$20 million. Another 30,000 persons will be assisted by private industry, by the great foundations like Ford, Rockefeller, and Carnegie, and by hospitals and medical schools, to study, teach, or do research at universities here and in 70 countries abroad.

A basketball clinic for coaches will be held in Japan; in Belgium the work of the first Center for Re-education of Cerebral Palsied Children will go on, as will that of a similar center in Norway; a school of journalism will operate at the University of Thammasat in Thailand, another at Nagpur University in India. All these programs have been made possible through the exchange of skills and sympathetic understanding between Americans and people abroad.

Inter-University Projects

In many instances the U.S. educational exchange program has been the means of establishing direct cooperation between American and foreign universities. In the field of such inter-university work, there is also another excellent program financed by the International Cooperation Administration in Washington. Under this program 53 American universities have contracts with Ica, totaling \$53.6 million, for partnerships with universities in 38 countries abroad. (In some contracts, private foundations like Ford and Rockefeller have taken over the financing when Ica's term was through.) These contracts are in the area of technical cooperation, and their yield to the United States in this cold-war period can hardly be exaggerated.

Tulane has one of these contracts for cooperation with the University of Colombia in developing medical education. A Tulane doctor has gone to Bogotá to make the primary survey; representatives of the University of Colombia will then come to Tulane for training, work will be done on such things as curricula and bibliography for the library, and a close joint effort will continue throughout the life of the contract. The Delgado Central Trades School in New Orleans has a contract for cooperation with the School of Arts and Crafts at Beirut, Lebanon, and another with the Kampala Technical Institute in the Protectorate of Uganda, Africa.

On every continent American universities are

helping to develop sound, stable societies through unremitting effort in the very practical fields of agriculture, education, engineering, public administration, public health, housing, vocational training, industrial development, home economics, sanitation, and other areas critical in the struggle to extend democracy.

The University of Michigan, for example, has done an outstanding job with the University of the Philippines in setting up an Institute of Public Administration. Oklahoma A. and M. has helped Ethiopia to establish an agricultural college. North Carolina is in Peru, Minnesota in Korea, Columbia in Afghanistan; Illinois, Ohio State, Tennessee, Wisconsin, Rensselaer, and Kansas are in India. Oregon is in Nepal. Others are in Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Pakistan, Turkey, Libya, Indonesia, Thailand, Viet-Nam, and Japan.

In Ethiopia, where a school was established with American university assistance, 437 boys applied for enrollment but only 79 could be accepted at first. One lad trekked 800 miles to Addis Ababa on foot, selling most of his clothes en route. Without food for the last 2 days, he arrived at the U.S. Operations Mission so weak that he had to be taken to a hospital—but not before he told why he had come: to attend that new school the Americans were helping to get started. He was accepted, I may add.

In Iran 73 schools have been set up for children of nomadic tribes, and the schools travel with the tribes as they migrate. The same sort of thing is being done for the Bedouins in Jordan. Tribal chieftains were so enthusiastic over this first educational program ever attempted for these nomads that they wanted to hold school 8 hours a day, 7 days a week.

Needless to say, most of these places are front-line battlefields in the cold war and American universities are there fighting communism tooth and nail. Let me tell you what a distinguished scholar wrote to his dean when sent abroad recently to survey the need of a contract between his university and a foreign institution:

This job will require men with a certain missionary spirit, but such men can exert an influence that might have tremendous significance in this forming nation. The easy recommendation would be to stay out and avoid all the headaches, and even possible failure. I cannot make that recommendation. I say this because I do not care to contemplate the alternative: to stay out and see this nation slip into chaos and communism while we make no effort to save it.

Study of World's Cultures

I remember, as a young newspaperman in New Orleans, interviewing the gifted Irish poet, James Stephens, who wrote "The Crock of Gold" and many other poems. Discussing the political fortunes of Ireland in the midtwenties, I asked Stephens what he thought Ireland's best defenses were. "Well," he replied, "we can always retreat into the Gaelic language. Nobody will ever find us there."

I submit that today it is impossible for the Irish, or any other sizable group in the world, to retreat into its own culture. The reason is that our country, principally through its universities, is now engaged in a remarkably complete study of the different cultures of the world.

This research consists largely of what are called "area study programs." To find out about them, I went to the State Department's External Research Staff, a unit of the Office of Intelligence Research, which devotes full time to keeping abreast of university research dealing with foreign area and foreign policy problems. There I was given details of literally thousands of inquiries into the problems of particular geographical regions, often a single country or a subgroup within a country. These research projects are being carried out by most of the country's universities or individual scholars, with 40 institutions carrying the major load of 81 full-scale programs.

The area study programs were taken up seriously during and just after World War II to meet the needs of Government policymakers and of American business concerns for information on economic, political, and social conditions abroad. Since then, and especially in the last 5 years, the area studies have expanded and intensified enormously. Today they are financed not only by the universities and by individuals but also by the great private foundations like Ford, Rockefeller, and Carnegie, and also, of course, by the Government, which continues to be one of the great users of this intelligence developed in the universities.

Tulane has at least two important area-study projects: the Latin American Studies Program and a special project on the penetration of Western ideas into the political processes of West African societies. The Latin American program has yielded richly in completed studies, including those on Guatemala, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Mexico, and many others on current problems.

Harvard, under a contract with the Air Force, has made microscopic studies of Soviet culture and behavior. (The External Research Staff lists well over 500 titles of research projects concentrated on Soviet Russia.) Through its Russian Research Center, Harvard also helps in the special language-and-area training given selected Foreign Service officers who will work in Moscow or satellite areas. Other universities prominent in this training program, coordinated with the Foreign Service Institute, are Columbia, Cornell, Yale, Princeton, and Stanford.

At Yale a series of handbooks on 50 foreign countries is being prepared for the Army for the purpose of preparing personnel going overseas to make the adjustment to their new environment.

At the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the Center of International Studies, concentrating on international communications, economics, and U.S. relations with the Communist bloc, is producing work widely used in the Government. Members of the faculty at the M.I.T. Center are consultants to the Armed Forces and to the U.S. Information Agency.

Other studies of utmost importance are those in basic individual and group behavior dynamics; in intergroup tensions and the problems of co-operation; in our own American behavior and culture; in what the rest of the world thinks of us, and why.

Fields for Further Expansion

I would like to point out a few ways in which the Department of State feels that universities might expand their activities if possible: (1) the granting of scholarships to qualified foreign students; (2) stipends for foreign lecturers or research scholars; (3) establishing further ties with particular foreign universities in fields of mutual interest (you may recall that, at Baylor University not long ago, President Eisenhower underscored the challenge to American universities and graduates in "this great two-way avenue of contacts");¹ (4) encouraging well-qualified American students to apply for scholarships, government or private, for study overseas; (5) encouraging faculty members to apply for lecturing or research positions abroad; (6) stressing the critical importance of foreign-language study in our trade

¹ BULLETIN of June 4, 1956, p. 915.

and cultural relations with other countries. Not only in the field of languages but in all others the Government looks to the universities to develop manpower for the Foreign Service.

Indeed, I can think of no more important function of the universities in the cold-war period than the continued education of young people, and of the entire adult population of the country, to understand themselves and the problems of their age. They must learn to understand the culture in which they were raised, including its weaknesses and faults, as well as the cultures of other people.

I submit that, up to now, we have also used only a fractional part of our social potential as nations in learning to get along together rationally rather than emotionally. I do not know that we will see a "breakthrough" in our lifetime, and I am sure that there will always be pathological individuals like Hitler who identify the motivations of large cultural groups with their own. But never, it appears to me, has the light of knowledge and of conscience been focused on these problems of behavior so sharply as today. I have tried to show how the work of the American university fits into this great struggle for the rational survival of mankind.

U.S.-Dominican Agreement on LORAN Station

Press release 161 dated March 19

The Governments of the United States and of the Dominican Republic entered into an agreement on March 19 by which the U.S. Government acquires the right to establish a Long Range Radio Aid to Navigation (LORAN) Station at Cape Frances Viejo on the northern coast of the Dominican Republic.

This station, one of a series constituting a net-

work in various countries of the Caribbean and other areas, will benefit air and sea navigation in this increasingly congested area. It will be manned by personnel of the U.S. Coast Guard.

United States and Japan Sign Income-Tax Protocol

Press release 173 dated March 23

On March 23, 1957, the American Ambassador to Japan, Douglas MacArthur II, and the Japanese Minister of Foreign Affairs, Nobusuke Kishi, signed at Tokyo a protocol supplementing the income-tax convention of April 16, 1954, between the United States and Japan.

The 1954 convention with Japan,¹ like income-tax conventions in force between the United States and 18 other countries, contains provisions for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income. The protocol, upon entry into force, will supplement the convention by providing that the Export-Import Bank of Washington shall be exempt from Japanese tax with respect to interest on loans or investments received by such bank from sources within Japan. Reciprocally, the Export-Import Bank of Japan shall be exempt from United States tax with respect to interest on loans or investments received from sources within the United States.

The protocol, according to its terms, will continue in force concurrently with the 1954 convention unless terminated earlier by a 6 months' written notice of termination given by either Government to the other Government.

The protocol will be transmitted to the Senate for advice and consent to ratification. The text of the protocol will be available in printed form upon publication of the Senate Executive document.

¹ Treaties and Other International Acts Series 3176.

Air Transport Agreement Between United States and Mexico

Press release 122 dated March 7

DEPARTMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

Francis White, United States Ambassador to Mexico, and Licenciado Luis Padilla Nervo, Secretary of Foreign Relations for Mexico, concluded on March 7 at Mexico City an exchange of notes providing for an air transport agreement between the two countries.

The exchange of notes, incorporating the understanding between the two countries, establishes the routes to be served by United States and Mexican flag airlines and contains the principles under which these routes will be operated.

The understanding between the two Governments also provides that the agreement shall become effective 90 days after the signature of the exchange and that it shall expire on June 30, 1959. At the request of either Government, made prior to May 30, 1959, conversations may be initiated looking to agreement concerning subsequent regulation of air transport between the two countries.

TEXT OF AGREEMENT

MÉXICO, D.F., March 7, 1957

His Excellency

Sr. Lic. LOUIS PADILLA NERVO,
Secretary of Foreign Relations,
México, D.F.

No. 942

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of Your Excellency's note No. 501404 of today's date, together with the attached Memorandum of Understanding and Annex, which read in translation as follows:

MR. AMBASSADOR: I have the honor to advise Your Excellency that the Government of Mexico, in a desire to contribute to the improvement of air transport between our two countries, is prepared to execute a provisional

arrangement regarding civil aviation with the Government of the United States of America in the terms of the Memorandum of Understanding and its Annex which I attach to the present note.

If, as I understand is the case, the Government of the United States of America is also willing to conclude such an arrangement on this basis, the present note and the note in reply from Your Excellency communicating your Government's acceptance of the Memorandum of Understanding and its Annex above-mentioned shall constitute a provisional arrangement regarding civil aviation between the two Governments.

I take this occasion to renew to Your Excellency the assurances of my highest consideration.

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

1. The aeronautical authorities of the Government of Mexico shall grant permits to airlines designated by the Government of the United States of America to operate air services on the air routes specified below, via intermediate points, in both directions, and to make regular stops at the points listed in this paragraph:

- A. New York, Washington-México City.
- B. Chicago, Dallas, San Antonio-México City, via intermediate points in the United States.
- C. Los Angeles-México City, via intermediate points in the United States.
- D. New Orleans-México City.
- E. New Orleans-Mérida, and beyond, to Guatemala, and beyond.
- F. Miami-Mérida, and beyond, to Guatemala, and beyond.
- G. Houston, Brownsville-Tampico, México City, Tapachula, and beyond, to Guatemala, and beyond.

The aeronautical authorities of the Government of the United States of America shall grant permits to airlines designated by the Government of Mexico to operate air services on each one of the air routes specified below, via intermediate points, in both directions, and to make regular stops at the points listed in this paragraph:

- A. México City-Washington, New York.
- B. México City-Chicago, via intermediate points in Mexico.
- C. México City-Los Angeles, via intermediate points in Mexico.
- D. México City-New Orleans, via intermediate points in Mexico.
- E. México City-Miami, and beyond, via intermediate points in Mexico.

F. Mexico City-San Antonio, via intermediate points in Mexico.

G. (Pending).

2. Both parties agree not to designate, for the present, more than one airline for each route.

3. An airline designated by either country may, at its discretion, omit stops on any of the routes specified on any or all flights.

4. The aeronautical operations of the designated lines shall be governed by the principles set forth in the Annex to the present Memorandum of Understanding.

5. The present Provisional Arrangement shall enter in force ninety days after the date of the exchange of notes.

6. The arrangement shall terminate June 30, 1959.

7. Upon request of either Government, prior to May 30, 1959, talks may be initiated to reach an agreement concerning a system to regulate air transport subsequent to June 30, 1959, between the two countries.

ANNEX

I

(A) The term "aeronautical authorities" means in the case of the United States of America, the Civil Aeronautics Board or any person or agency authorized to perform the functions exercised at the present time by the Civil Aeronautics Board and, in the case of the United Mexican States, the Ministry of Communications and Public Works or any person or agency authorized to perform the functions exercised at present by the said Ministry of Communications and Public Works.

(B) The term "designated airline" means an airline that one party has notified to the other party, in writing, to be the airline which will operate a specific route or routes listed in the Memorandum of Understanding.

(C) The term "territory" in relation to a State means the land areas and territorial waters adjacent thereto under the sovereignty, suzerainty, protection, mandate or trusteeship of that State.

(D) The term "air service" means scheduled air service performed by aircraft for the public transport of passengers, mail or cargo.

(E) The term "international air service" means an air service which flies over the territory of more than one State.

(F) The term "stop for non-traffic purposes" means a landing for any purpose other than taking on or discharging passengers, cargo or mail.

II

Each party grants to the other party rights necessary for the conduct of air services by the designated airlines, as follows: the rights of transit, of stops for non-traffic purposes, and of commercial entry and departure for international traffic in passengers, cargo, and mail at the points in its territory named on each of the routes specified in the Memorandum of Understanding. The fact that such rights may not be exercised immediately shall not preclude the subsequent inauguration of air services by the airlines of the party to whom such

rights are granted over the routes specified in the Memorandum of Understanding.

III

Air service on a specified route may be inaugurated immediately or at a later date at the option of the party to whom the rights are granted by an airline or airlines of such party at any time after that party has designated such airline or airlines for the route and the other party has given the appropriate operating permission. Such other party shall, subject to Section IV, be bound to give this permission provided that the designated airline or airlines may be required to qualify before the competent aeronautical authorities of that party, under the laws and regulations normally applied by these authorities, before being permitted to engage in the operations contemplated by the Memorandum of Understanding and this Annex.

IV

Each party reserves the right to withhold or revoke the operating permission provided for in Section III of this Annex from an airline designated by the other party in the event that it is not satisfied that substantial ownership and effective control of such airline are vested in nationals of the other party or in case of failure by such airline to comply with the laws and regulations referred to in Section V of the present Annex, or in case of the failure of the airline or the Government designating it to fulfill the conditions under which the rights are granted in accordance with the Provisional Arrangement.

V

(A) The laws and regulations of one party relating to the admission to or departure from its territory of aircraft engaged in international air navigation, or to the operation and navigation of such aircraft while within its territory, shall be applied to the aircraft of the airline or airlines designated by the other party and shall be complied with by such aircraft upon entering or departing from, and while within the territory of the first party.

(B) The laws and regulations of one party relating to the admission to or departure from its territory of passengers, crew, or cargo of aircraft, such as regulations relating to entry, clearance, immigration, passports, customs, and quarantine shall be complied with by or on behalf of such passengers, crew or cargo of the other party upon entrance into or departure from, and while within the territory of the first party.

VI

Certificates of airworthiness, certificates of competency and licenses issued or rendered valid by one party, and still in force, shall be recognized as valid by the other party for the purpose of operating the routes and services provided for in the Memorandum of Understanding and in the present Annex, provided that the requirements under which such certificates or licenses were issued or rendered valid are equal to or above the minimum standards which may be established pursuant to the Convention on International Civil Aviation. Each party reserves

the right, however, to refuse to recognize, for the purpose of flight above its own territory, certificates of competency and licenses granted to its own nationals by another State.

VII

In order to prevent discriminatory practices and to assure equality of treatment, both parties agree further to observe the following principles:

(a) Each of the parties may impose or permit to be imposed just and reasonable charges for the use of public airports and other facilities under its control. Each of the parties agrees, however, that these charges shall not be higher than would be paid for the use of such airports and facilities by its national aircraft engaged in similar international services.

(b) Fuel, lubricating oils, consumable technical supplies, spare parts, regular equipment, and stores introduced into the territory of one party by the other party or its nationals, and intended solely for use by aircraft of such party shall be exempt on a basis of reciprocity from customs duties, inspection fees and other national duties or charges.

(c) Fuel, lubricating oils, other consumable technical supplies, spare parts, regular equipment, and stores retained on board aircraft of the airlines of one party authorized to operate the routes and services provided for in the Memorandum of Understanding and in this Annex shall, upon arriving in or leaving the territory of the other party, be exempt on a basis of reciprocity from customs duties, inspection fees and other national duties or charges, even though such supplies be used or consumed by such aircraft on flights in that territory.

(d) Fuel, lubricating oils, other consumable technical supplies, spare parts, regular equipment, and stores taken on board aircraft of the airlines of one party in the territory of the other and used in international services shall be exempt on a basis of reciprocity from customs duties, excise taxes, inspection fees and other national duties or charges.

VIII

There shall be a fair and equal opportunity for the airlines of each party to operate on the routes listed in the Memorandum of Understanding.

IX

In the operation by the airlines of either party of the trunk services described in the Memorandum of Understanding the interest of the airlines of the other party shall be taken into consideration so as not to affect unduly the services which the latter provide on all or part of the same routes.

X

The services made available to the public by the airlines operating under the Provisional Arrangement shall bear a close relationship to the requirements of the public for such services.

It is understood that services provided by a designated airline under the Memorandum of Understanding and the present Annex shall retain as their primary objective the provision of capacity adequate to the traffic demands be-

tween the country of which such airline is a national and the countries of ultimate destination of the traffic. The right to embark or disembark on such services international traffic destined for and coming from third countries at a point or points on the routes specified in the Memorandum of Understanding shall be applied in accordance with the general principles of orderly development to which both parties subscribe and shall be subject to the general principle that capacity should be related:

(a) to traffic requirements between the country of origin and the countries of ultimate destination of the traffic;

(b) to the requirements of through airline operation; and,

(c) to the traffic requirements of the area through which the airline passes after taking account of local and regional services.

Both parties agree to recognize that the fifth freedom traffic is complementary to the traffic requirements on the routes between the territories of the parties, and at the same time is subsidiary in relation to the traffic requirements of the third and fourth freedoms between the territory of the other party and a country on the route.

In this connection both parties recognize that the development of local and regional services is a legitimate right of each of their countries. They agree therefore to consult periodically on the manner in which the standards mentioned in this section are being complied with by their respective airlines, in order to assure that their respective interests in the local and regional services as well as through services are not being prejudiced.

Every change of gauge justifiable for reasons of economy of operation, shall be permitted at any stop on the designated routes. Nevertheless, no change of gauge may be made in the territory of one or the other party when it modifies the characteristics of the operation of a through airline service or if it is incompatible with the principles enunciated in the present Annex.

When one of the parties after a period of observation of not less than ninety days considers that an increase in capacity or frequency offered by an airline of the other party is unjustified or prejudicial to the services of its respective airline it shall notify the other party of its objection to the end that consultation be initiated between the appropriate aeronautical authorities and decision on the objection be made by mutual agreement within a period which may not be more than ninety days beginning on the date of such notification. For this purpose the operating companies shall supply all traffic statistics that may be necessary and required of them.

XI

Rates to be charged on the routes provided for in the Memorandum of Understanding shall be reasonable, due regard being paid to all relevant factors, such as cost of operation, reasonable profit, and the rates charged by any other carriers, as well as the characteristics of each service, and shall be determined in accordance with the following paragraphs:

(A) The rates to be charged by the airlines of either party between points in the territory of the United States

of America and points in the territory of the United Mexican States referred to in the Memorandum of Understanding shall, consistent with the provisions of the present Annex, be subject to the approval of the aeronautical authorities of the parties, who shall act in accordance with their obligations under the Provisional Arrangement, within the limits of their legal powers.

(B) Any rate proposed by an airline of either party shall be filed with the aeronautical authorities of both parties at least thirty (30) days before the proposed date of introduction; provided that this period of thirty (30) days may be reduced in particular cases if so agreed by the aeronautical authorities of both parties.

(C) During any period for which the Civil Aeronautics Board of the United States of America has approved the traffic conference procedures of the International Air Transport Association (hereinafter called IATA), any rate agreements concluded through these procedures and involving United States airlines will be subject to approval of the Board. Likewise, agreements concluded through this machinery may also be required to be subject to the approval of the aeronautical authorities of the United Mexican States pursuant to the principles enunciated in paragraph (A) above.

(D) The procedure described in paragraphs (E), (F) and (G) of this Section shall apply:

1. If, during the period of the approval by both parties of the IATA traffic conference procedure, either, any specific rate agreement is not approved within a reasonable time by either party, or, a conference of IATA is unable to agree on a rate,

or

2. At any time no IATA procedure is applicable, or

3. If either party at any time withdraws or fails to renew its approval of that part of the IATA traffic conference procedure relevant to this Section.

(E) In the event that power is conferred by law upon the aeronautical authorities of the United States of America to fix fair and economic rates for the transport of persons and property by air on international services and to suspend proposed rates in a manner comparable to that in which the Civil Aeronautics Board at present is empowered to act with respect to such rates for the transport of persons and property by air within the United States of America, each of the parties shall thereafter exercise its authority in such manner as to prevent any rate or rates proposed by one of its airlines for services from the territory of one party to a point or points in the territory of the other party from becoming effective, if in the judgment of the aeronautical authorities of the party whose airline or airlines is or are proposing such rate, that rate is unfair or uneconomic. If one of the parties on receipt of the notification referred to in paragraph (B) above is dissatisfied with the rate proposed by the airline or airlines of the other party, it shall so notify the other party prior to the expiry of the first fifteen (15) of the thirty (30) days referred to, and the parties shall endeavor to reach agreement on the appropriate rate.

In the event that such agreement is reached, each party will exercise its best efforts to put such rate into effect as regards its airline or airlines.

If agreement has not been reached at the end of the thirty (30) day period referred to in paragraph (B) above, the proposed rate may, unless the aeronautical authorities of the country of the air carrier concerned see fit to suspend its application, go into effect provisionally pending the settlement of any dispute in accordance with the procedure outlined in paragraph (G) below.

(F) Prior to the time when such power may be conferred upon the aeronautical authorities of the United States of America, if one of the parties is dissatisfied with any rate proposed by the airline or airlines of either party for services from the territory of one party to a point or points in the territory of the other party, it shall so notify the other party prior to the expiry of the first fifteen (15) of the thirty (30) day period referred to in paragraph (B) above, and the parties shall endeavor to reach agreement on the appropriate rate.

In the event that such agreement is reached, each party will use its best efforts to cause such agreed rate to be put into effect by its airline or airlines.

If no agreement can be reached prior to the expiry of such thirty (30) days, the party raising the objection to the rate may take such steps as it may consider necessary to prevent the inauguration or continuation of the service in question at the rate complained of.

(G) When in any case under paragraphs (E) or (F) of this Section the aeronautical authorities of the two parties cannot agree within a reasonable time upon the appropriate rate after consultation initiated by the complaint of one party concerning a proposed rate or an existing rate of the airline or airlines of the other party, upon the request of either, the terms of Section XIII of this Annex shall apply.

XII

Consultation between the competent authorities of both parties may be requested at any time by either party for the purpose of discussing the interpretation, application, or amendment of the Provisional Arrangement or Route Schedule (Point 1 of the Memorandum of Understanding). Such consultation shall begin within a period of sixty (60) days from the date of the receipt of the request by the Department of State of the United States of America or the Ministry of Foreign Relations of the United Mexican States as the case may be. Should agreement be reached on amendment of the Provisional Arrangement or Schedule of Routes, such amendment will come into effect upon confirmation by a further exchange of diplomatic notes.

XIII

Except as otherwise provided, any dispute between the parties relative to the interpretation or application of the Provisional Arrangement which cannot be settled through consultation shall be submitted for an advisory report to a tribunal of three arbitrators, one to be named by each party, and the third to be agreed upon by the two arbitrators so chosen, provided that such a third arbitrator shall not be a national of either party. Each of the parties shall designate an arbitrator within two months of the date of delivery by either party to the other party of a diplomatic note requesting arbitration of a dispute; and the third arbitrator shall be agreed upon within one month after such period of two months.

If either of the parties fails to designate its own arbitrator within two months, or if the third arbitrator is not agreed upon within the time limit indicated, either party may request the President of the International Court of Justice to make the necessary appointment or appointments by choosing the arbitrator or arbitrators.

The parties will use their best efforts under the powers available to them to put into effect the opinion expressed in any such advisory report. A moiety of the expenses of the arbitral tribunal shall be borne by each party.

XIV

The Provisional Arrangement, all amendments thereto, and contracts connected therewith shall be registered with the International Civil Aviation Organization.

XV

If a general multilateral air transport Convention accepted by both parties enters into force, the Provisional Arrangement shall be amended so as to conform with the provisions of such Convention.

XVI

Either of the two parties may at any time notify the other party of its intention to terminate the Provisional Arrangement. Such notice shall be sent simultaneously to the International Civil Aviation Organization. In case such notification should be given the arrangement would terminate six months after the date on which the notice of termination may have been received, unless the communication under reference is annulled before the end of this period by agreement between both parties. Should the other party not acknowledge receipt it shall be considered that the notification was received by it 14 days subsequent to the date on which it is received by the International Civil Aviation Organization.

XVII

Upon entry into effect of the Provisional Arrangement the aeronautical authorities of the two parties must communicate to each other as soon as possible the information relating to authorizations given to the airline or airlines designated by them to operate the routes mentioned in the Memorandum of Understanding.

XVIII

The aeronautical authorities of both parties shall respectively advise each other eight days before the actual placing in operation of their respective permits the following data: schedules, frequencies, tariffs and types of aircraft normally utilized in their services. Any modification of the data under reference shall similarly be communicated.

In reply, I have the honor to advise Your Excellency that the Government of the United States of America is prepared to conclude a provisional arrangement on the basis proposed in Your Excellency's note, Memorandum of Understanding and Annex under reference, and accept your proposal to regard that note, the Memorandum of

Understanding and Annex and the present reply as constituting a provisional arrangement regarding civil aviation between our two Governments.

Please accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

FRANCIS WHITE

U.S. and Netherlands Resume Air Transport Negotiations

Following is a Department announcement concerning the resumption on March 19 of negotiations on the U.S.-Netherlands air transport agreement, together with an exchange of letters between President Eisenhower and Dr. Willem Drees, Prime Minister of the Netherlands.

DEPARTMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

Press release 163 dated March 19

Delegations of the Governments of the United States and the Kingdom of the Netherlands resumed negotiations on March 19 for the conclusion of a bilateral air transport agreement. The negotiations were suspended last May.

The chairman of the Netherlands delegation is E. H. van der Beugel, State Secretary for Foreign Affairs. The vice chairman is H. J. Spanjaard, director of the Department of Civil Aviation, Ministry of Transport and Waterways. The other members of the delegation are Baron S. G. M. van Voorst tot Voorst, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at the Netherlands Embassy in Washington; J. C. Nieuwenhuijsen, Ministry of Foreign Affairs; E. D. Baiz, representative of the Government of the Netherlands Antilles; F. J. Barend, representative of the Government of Surinam; L. H. Slotemaker, managing director of KLM, Royal Dutch Airlines; and S. C. van Nispen, commercial secretary at the Netherlands Embassy in Washington.

The U.S. delegation is headed by Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs; vice chairman is G. Joseph Minetti, member, Civil Aeronautics Board. Other members of the delegation are H. Alberta Colclaser, Hendrik van Oss, and John P. Walsh, Department of State; Raymond Sawyer and Joseph C. Watson, Civil Aeronautics Board. Bradley D. Nash, Deputy Under Secretary of Commerce for Trans-

portation, will be an adviser to the U.S. delegation, and Paul Reiber, representing the Air Transport Association of America, will attend as an observer.

EXCHANGE OF LETTERS

Press release 166 dated March 21

The Prime Minister's Letter

THE HAGUE, 28th February 1957

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Your many responsibilities in American and world affairs will undoubtedly make it impossible for you to follow closely all questions pertaining to the bilateral relationship of the United States of America and the Netherlands, however united our countries are in the cause of the free world. I have therefore hesitated before writing you this personal letter to ask your special attention for the negotiations on an air transport agreement between the Netherlands and the United States, which are to begin in Washington on March 19th next.

These negotiations probably are of minor importance as compared to the many problems which the world at the present moment is facing, but Her Majesty's Government, the Parliament and the people of the Netherlands consider their outcome to be vital to the economy of my country.

The special geographic and demographic situation of my country, its limited natural resources, require that the Netherlands maintain its historic position as a world carrier, if it is to pull its weight as a sound member of the Western Alliance.

It is for this reason that I am taking the exceptional step of writing you to draw your attention to these negotiations, which naturally will be followed very closely by the Government and the people of the Netherlands.

The traditional friendship between your great nation and the Netherlands encourages me to feel

confident that you may see your way to giving this matter some personal thought. I am convinced that this would be extremely helpful in bringing about a favorable outcome of these discussions.

While thanking you in advance for anything which you may be able to do in this respect, I avail myself of this opportunity to send you the assurances of my highest esteem and of my feelings of sincere friendship.

W. DREES

The President's Letter

MARCH 18, 1957

DEAR MR. PRIME MINISTER: I was very pleased to receive from the Ambassador of The Netherlands your letter of February 28 concerning the significance which the Government and people of The Netherlands attach to the forthcoming civil air negotiations between our two countries. I am glad that you did not hesitate to write me directly about a matter which affects so vitally the relations between the United States and The Netherlands. Both of our countries, which have joined with other like-minded nations to achieve certain mutual objectives in NATO, have as a common purpose the healthy expansion of our free economies, so necessary for the maintenance of the Western Alliance.

I place, as do the people of the United States, a very high value on maintaining and strengthening our close relations with The Netherlands. Such a relationship not only permits, but requires the frank exchange of views on problems of mutual concern. I have instructed the United States Delegation for the forthcoming civil air negotiations to give the most serious consideration to the factors described in your letter.

Sincerely yours,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

Notice of Intention To Enter Into Limited Trade Agreement Negotiations With the United Kingdom and Belgium¹

The Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements on March 18 issued notice of the intention of the U.S. Government, under the authority of the Trade Agreements Act as amended and extended, to enter into limited trade agreement negotiations with certain contracting parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

These negotiations are being held in connection with requests for compensatory tariff concessions by the United Kingdom and Belgium on the basis of the increase last year of the U.S. rate of duty on certain linen toweling. The increase from 10 percent to 40 percent ad valorem in the rate of duty on linen toweling became effective on July 26, 1956.²

The action to increase the duty was taken under the escape-clause provision of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade after a finding by the U.S. Tariff Commission that domestic industry was being seriously injured as a result of increased imports caused at least in part by a tariff concession which was initially negotiated with the United Kingdom in the agreement.

In accordance with the escape-clause provision, the United States has consulted with the countries having a substantial interest as exporters of linen toweling. The United Kingdom and Belgium, both of which have exported substantial quantities of linen toweling to the United States, have requested compensation for the U.S. action, which they consider an impairment of the concession. Japan, a small supplier of toweling, has indicated that it would expect to benefit from compensation granted to the other supplying countries. Ordin-

narily the country using some procedure under the general agreement to increase a duty which is the subject of a concession grants compensatory concessions to the countries adversely affected. Should agreement on such compensatory concessions not be reached provision is usually made for the affected country to suspend equivalent concessions.

Tariff concessions by the United States will be considered within the limitation of authority available to the President under the Trade Agreements Act as amended. The Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955 provides that rates may be reduced 15 percent below the January 1, 1955, rates by stages of 5 percent a year over a 3-year period but that no stage or reduction may be made effective after June 30, 1958. Consequently there remains authority to reduce rates to as much as 10 percent below the January 1, 1955, rate, in two annual stages of 5 percent each.

In accordance with past practice and the requirements of trade agreements legislation, the committee's notice sets in motion preparations for the negotiations, including opportunity for presentation by interested persons of both written and oral views on possible concessions which may be granted and the determination of "peril points" by the U.S. Tariff Commission on products on which the United States will consider granting concessions.

Included with the committee's notice is a list of products, some of which might be offered as compensatory concessions.

The Committee for Reciprocity Information announces that its hearings to receive the views of interested persons concerning the proposed negotiations will open on April 24, 1957. Domestic producers, importers, and other interested persons are invited to present to the committee views and all pertinent information about products on the

¹ This material is also available as Department of State publication 6470 and may be obtained from the Division of Public Services, Department of State, Washington 25, D.C. See also 22 Fed. Reg. 1878.

² BULLETIN of July 16, 1956, p. 115.

published list or any other aspect of the negotiations. All views and information will be carefully considered in deciding whether or not a concession should be offered by the United States. Consideration will also be given to all relevant information submitted to the Committee for Reciprocity Information in connection with its hearings in October 1955 and January 1956 in preparation for the Geneva tariff negotiations. Accordingly, persons who presented information and views at those hearings regarding products on the attached list and who do not desire to modify or supplement such material, need not—but may if they wish—repeat their written or oral submissions.

Applications for oral presentation of views and information should be presented to the Committee for Reciprocity Information not later than the close of business April 17, 1957. Persons desiring to be heard should also submit written briefs or statements to the committee by April 17, 1957. Only those persons will be heard who have presented written briefs or statements and have filed applications to be heard by the dates indicated. Communications are to be addressed to "Committee for Reciprocity Information, Tariff Commission Building, Washington 25, D.C." Further details concerning the submission of briefs and applications to be heard are contained in the committee's notice.

The membership of the Committee on Trade Agreements and of the Committee for Reciprocity Information is identical, consisting of representatives of the Departments of State, Treasury, Defense, Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, and Interior, and the International Cooperation Administration, as well as a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission. The Department of State member is the chairman of the Committee on Trade Agreements, while the Tariff Commission member is the chairman of the Committee for Reciprocity Information.

The U.S. Tariff Commission also announced on March 18 that it will hold public hearings beginning April 24, 1957, in connection with its "peril point" investigation, as required by section 3(a) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, on the extent to which U.S. concessions on listed products may be made in the negotiations without causing or threatening serious injury to a domestic industry producing like or directly competitive

products. Copies of the notice may be obtained from the Commission. Views and information received by the Tariff Commission on its hearings referred to above will be made available to the Committee for Reciprocity Information for consideration by the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements. Persons who appear before the Tariff Commission need not—but may if they wish—also appear before the Committee for Reciprocity Information, if they apply in accordance with the procedures of that committee as outlined above.

INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE ON TRADE AGREEMENTS

Trade agreement negotiations with governments which are contracting parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade regarding compensation for escape clause action.

Pursuant to Section 4 of the Trade Agreements Act, approved June 12, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 945, ch. 474; 65 Stat. 73, ch. 141) and to paragraph 4 of Executive Order 10082 of October 5, 1949 (3 CFR, 1949 Supp., p. 126), and in view of certain "escape clause" action with respect to toweling of flax, hemp, or ramie taken by the President on June 25, 1956 (Proclamation 3143, 3 CFR, 1956 Supp., p. 33) under the authority of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (48 Stat. 943, ch. 474) and Section 7(c) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 (65 Stat. 74, ch. 141), notice is hereby given by the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements of intention to enter into trade agreement negotiations under Article XIX of the General Agreement regarding compensation to contracting parties to the Agreement that have a substantial interest as exporters for such escape clause action. Since the purpose of the negotiations is the granting of compensatory concessions by the United States, it is not anticipated that they will result in any concessions by other countries for the benefit of United States exports. The results of these negotiations would be embodied in Schedule XX to the General Agreement.

There is annexed hereto a list of articles imported into the United States to be considered for possible modification of duties and other import restrictions, or specific continuance of existing customs or excise treatment in the negotiations of which notice is given above.

The articles proposed for consideration in the negotiations are identified in the annexed list by specifying the numbers of the paragraphs in tariff schedules of Title I of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, in which they are provided for together with the language used in such tariff paragraphs to provide for such articles, except that where necessary the statutory language has been modified by the omission of words or the addition of new language in order to narrow the scope of the original language.

No article will be considered in the negotiations for

pos
im
co
it
lis
me
im
spe
for
du
oth
an
gra
wh
un
fr
clu
nev

am
Oe
of
mi
acc
tha
sid
ma

I
ga
tio
to
195
thi
I
Tr

lis
F
N
1

52
93
218

Ap

possible modification of duties or other import restrictions, imposition of additional import restrictions, or specific continuance of existing customs or excise treatment unless it is included, specifically or by reference, in the annexed list or unless it is subsequently included in a supplementary public list. Only duties on the articles listed imposed under the paragraphs of the Tariff Act of 1930 specified with regard to such articles will be considered for a possible decrease, but additional or separate ordinary duties or import taxes on such articles imposed under any other provisions of law may be bound against increase as an assurance that the concession under the listed paragraph will not be nullified. In the event that an article which as of March 1, 1957 was regarded as classifiable under a description included in the list is excluded therefrom by judicial decision or otherwise prior to the conclusion of the trade agreement negotiations, the list will nevertheless be considered as including such article.

Pursuant to Section 4 of the Trade Agreements Act, as amended, and paragraph 5 of Executive Order 10082 of October 5, 1949, information and views as to any aspect of the proposals announced in this notice may be submitted to the Committee for Reciprocity Information in accordance with the announcement of this date issued by that Committee. Any matters appropriate to be considered in connection with the negotiations proposed above may be presented.

Public hearings in connection with "peril point" investigation of the United States Tariff Commission in connection with the articles included in the annexed list pursuant to Section 3 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, are the subject of an announcement of this date issued by that Commission.

By direction of the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements this 18th day of March 1957.

CARL D. CORSE
Chairman
Interdepartmental Committee
on Trade Agreements

LIST OF ARTICLES IMPORTED INTO THE UNITED STATES PROPOSED FOR CONSIDERATION IN TRADE AGREEMENT NEGOTIATIONS

Par.	Tariff Act of 1930, Title I—Dutiable List
5	All chemical elements, all chemical salts and compounds, and all combinations and mixtures of any of the foregoing, all the foregoing obtained naturally or artificially and not specially provided for: Sodium alginate.
52	Sperm oil, refined or otherwise processed; spermaceti wax.
93	Zinc chloride; zinc sulphate.
218(a)	Biological, chemical, metallurgical, pharmaceutical, and surgical articles and utensils of all kinds, including all scientific articles and utensils, whether used for experimental purposes in hospitals, laboratories, schools or universities, colleges, or otherwise, all the foregoing, finished or unfinished, wholly or in chief value of fused quartz or fused silica.
372	Textile machinery, finished or unfinished, not specially provided for: Machinery for manufacturing or processing vegetable fibers other than cotton or jute prior to the making of fabrics or crocheted, knit, woven, or felt articles not made from fabrics (except beaming, slashing, warping, or winding machinery or combinations thereof, and except bleaching, printing, dyeing, or finishing machinery).
906	Cloth, in chief value of cotton, containing wool. [Note: Paragraph 1122, Tariff Act of 1930, limits the wool content of cloth classifiable under paragraph 906 to less than 17 percent in weight.]
907	Tracing cloth; waterproof cloth, wholly or in chief value of cotton or other vegetable fiber, but not in part of india rubber.
921	All other floor coverings, including carpets, carpeting, mats, and rugs, wholly or in chief value of cotton: Imitation oriental rugs.
1009(c)	Woven fabrics, in the piece or otherwise, wholly or in chief value of vegetable fiber, except cotton, filled, coated, or otherwise prepared for use as artists' canvas.
1010	Woven fabrics, not including articles finished or unfinished, of flax, hemp, ramie, or other vegetable fiber, except cotton or jute, or of which these substances or any of them is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for (except toweling, i. e., fabrics chiefly used for making towels, of flax, hemp, or ramie, or of which these substances or any of them is the component material of chief value).
1410	Unbound books of all kinds, bound books of all kinds except those bound wholly or in part in leather, sheets or printed pages of books bound wholly or in part in leather, all the foregoing not specially provided for, if other than of bona fide foreign authorship (not including diaries, music in books, pamphlets, prayer books, sheets or printed pages of prayer books bound wholly or in part in leather, or tourist literature containing geographic, historical, hotel, timetable, travel, or similar information, chiefly with respect to places or travel facilities outside the continental United States).

COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION

Trade Agreement Negotiations with Governments which are contracting parties to the General Agreement on

Tariffs and Trade regarding compensation for escape clause action.

Submission of information to the Committee for Reciprocity Information.

Closing date for applications to appear at hearing April 17, 1957.

Closing date for submission of briefs April 17, 1957.

Public hearings open April 24, 1957.

The Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements has issued on this day a notice of intention to participate in trade agreement negotiations under Article XIX of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade regarding compensation to contracting parties to the Agreement that have a substantial interest as exporters for the escape clause action with respect to toweling of flax, hemp, or ramie taken by the President on June 25, 1956. Annexed to the notice of the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements is a list of articles imported into the United States to be considered for possible concessions in the negotiations. Since the purpose of the negotiations is the granting of compensatory concessions by the United States, it is not anticipated that they will result in any concessions by other countries for the benefit of United States exports.

The Committee for Reciprocity Information hereby gives notice that all applications for oral presentation of views in regard to the proposed renegotiations shall be submitted to the Committee for Reciprocity Information not later than April 17, 1957. The application must indicate the product or products on which the individual or groups desire to be heard and an estimate of the time required for oral presentation. Written statements shall be submitted not later than April 17, 1957. Such communications shall be addressed to "Committee for Reciprocity Information, Tariff Commission Building, Washington 25, D. C." Fifteen copies of written statements, either typed, printed, or duplicated shall be submitted, of which one copy shall be sworn to.

Written statements submitted to the Committee, except information and business data proffered in confidence, shall be open to inspection by interested persons. Information and business data proffered in confidence shall be submitted on separate pages clearly marked *For Official Use Only of Committee for Reciprocity Information*.

Public hearings will be held before the Committee for Reciprocity Information, at which oral statements will be heard, beginning at 2:00 p. m. on April 24, 1957 in the hearing room in the Tariff Commission Building, Eighth and E Streets N. W., Washington, D. C. Witnesses who make application to be heard will be advised regarding the time and place of their individual appearances. Appearances at hearings before the Committee may be made only by or on behalf of those persons who have filed written statements and who have within the time prescribed made written application for oral presentation of views. Statements made at the public hearings shall be under oath.

Persons may present their views regarding any matter appropriate to be considered in connection with the proposed negotiations, although, as indicated above, it is not

anticipated that they will result in any concessions by other countries for the benefit of United States exports. Copies of the list attached to the notice of intention to negotiate may be obtained from the Committee for Reciprocity Information at the address designated above and may be inspected at the field offices of the Department of Commerce.

The United States Tariff Commission has today announced public hearings on the import items appearing in the list annexed to the notice of intention to negotiate to run concurrently with the hearings of the Committee for Reciprocity Information. Oral testimony and written information submitted to the Tariff Commission will be made available to and will be considered by the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements. Consequently, those whose interests relate only to import products included in the foregoing list, and who appear before the Tariff Commission, need not, but may if they wish, appear also before the Committee for Reciprocity Information.

By direction of the Committee for Reciprocity Information this 18th day of March 1957.

EDWARD YARDLEY

Secretary,

Committee for Reciprocity Information

President Asks Study of Tariff Quota on Alsike Clover Seed

White House press release dated March 14

The President on March 14 requested the Tariff Commission to determine whether and to what extent the present tariff quota on alsike clover seed will remain necessary after June 30, 1957.

In an escape-clause proceeding under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act, the President adopted on June 30, 1954, a Tariff Commission recommendation for a tariff quota providing a duty of 2 cents per pound up to 1,500,000 pounds and 6 cents per pound for imports in excess of that amount.¹ The tariff quota was established for 1 year. At the President's request the Commission submitted a supplemental report, and on June 29, 1955, the President liberalized the tariff quota and extended it for 2 years.² The present tariff is 6 cents per pound on imports exceeding 2,500,000 pounds and 2 cents per pound up to that amount. It expires on June 30, 1957.

¹ BULLETIN of Aug. 2, 1954, p. 167.

² Ibid., July 18, 1955, p. 116.

President Decides Against Study of Tariff on Hatters' Fur

White House press release dated March 14

The President on March 14 concurred with the Tariff Commission's recent finding that no formal investigation should be instituted at this time to determine whether the tariff should be reduced on imports of hatters' fur. The President found, with the Tariff Commission, that there is no sufficient reason at this time to reopen the escape-clause action which resulted in an increase of the duty on imports of hatters' fur. The President's decision means that the increased rate of duty, established in 1952¹ as a result of escape-clause action, will continue to apply without reduction or other modification.

The President's action was taken after the views of all interested departments and agencies of the executive branch had been received and studied. The Tariff Commission's report was made pursuant to Executive Order 10401, which requires periodic review of actions taken under the escape clause. It was transmitted to the President on February 4, 1957.

The tariff on hatters' fur was reduced as the result of trade agreement negotiations in 1935 and again in 1948. Effective February 9, 1952, the tariff on imports of hatters' fur was increased as the result of an escape-clause action to its present rate of 47½ cents per pound, but not less than 15 percent nor more than 35 percent ad valorem.

The Tariff Commission's report constitutes its fourth periodic review of the escape-clause action taken on this product.²

President Orders Investigation of Effects of Tung Oil Imports

White House press release dated March 22

The President has requested the U.S. Tariff Commission to make an immediate investigation of the effects of imports of tung oil on the domestic price-support program for tung nuts and tung oil and on the amount of products processed in the United States from tung nuts or tung oil. The President's action was taken in response to a recommendation from the Secretary of Agriculture.

¹ BULLETIN of Jan. 21, 1952, p. 96.

² Copies of the report may be obtained from the U.S. Tariff Commission, Washington 25, D.C.

The Commission's investigation will be made pursuant to section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended.

President's Letter to Chairman of Tariff Commission

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have been advised by the Secretary of Agriculture that there is reason to believe that tung oil is being and is practically certain to continue to be imported into the United States under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective or to materially interfere with the price support program for tung nuts and tung oil undertaken by the Department of Agriculture, pursuant to Section 201 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1949, as amended, or to reduce substantially the amount of products processed in the United States from domestic tung nuts and tung oil. A copy of the Secretary's letter is enclosed.¹

The Tariff Commission is requested to make an immediate investigation under Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, to determine if there is a need for restrictions on tung oil imports. The Commission's findings should be completed as promptly as practicable.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

U.N. Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees

Following are the texts of two statements made in the Special Political Committee by Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, U.S. Representative to the General Assembly, together with a U.S.-sponsored resolution adopted in plenary session on February 28.

STATEMENT OF FEBRUARY 18

U.S. delegation press release 2620

I am very much impressed with the comprehensive reports of the Director of the United

¹ Not printed.

Nations Relief and Works Agency.¹ After hearing his own excellent statement of last week, I wish first of all to pay tribute to Mr. [Henry R.] Labouisse and to the many faithful members of his agency. They have really done a most competent job under stringent limitations and unusually difficult circumstances in taking care of the welfare of the Arab refugees.

My Government has the widest sympathy and understanding for the plight of these refugees. I am personally concerned, for, Mr. Chairman, I have seen refugees all over the world—in Germany, Pakistan, India, Viet-Nam, Formosa—but the refugee camps I visited in the Middle East—Lebanon and Jordan are the most depressing because of the fact that these refugees have been there so long and seem to have so little to hope for.

This in itself is depressing enough, but it is even more depressing and unfortunate that, although we have considered their plight here year after year, the situation is *not* improving. Not only is it *not* improving—it is *not* being solved. Why? To my Government and to me there are three major elements that seem to stand out, and I want to elaborate on all three—but to sum them up:

First, a decision was made over 8 years ago that refugees would have the right to decide whether they should be repatriated or whether they should be compensated. Second, let's face the fact there has been some deterioration of relations between the agency and some of the host governments. Third, and most important, a good deal of lack of progress is due to the question of contributions.

Let's take the first point, that the refugees continue to live in the faith of the promise made to them 8 years ago that they will be repatriated to Israel or compensated. This has not been put into effect. The United States Government believes that with the minimum of good faith and willful understanding of particular and emotional problems involved we should find a way to settle this problem.

Let's take a look at the second problem—the deterioration of relations between the agency and some of the host governments. I don't have to remind the delegates of some of the unjustified instances of noncooperation on the part of some of the host governments that Mr. Labouisse has cited in his report. This type of noncooperation

between a host government and the Director and his responsible officials, fellow delegates, is inconsistent with the obligations as outlined in articles 104 and 105 of the charter.

This is really a matter of concern because, if any United Nations agency finds that host governments do not respect their charter obligations, the Director of that particular agency would have the right to suspend, curtail, or terminate its activities. I am sure that all would agree with the United States Government that, whether it is with the United Nations Relief and Works Agency or any other agency, the Director, if unable to carry out his assigned functions under the protection of the resolution which governs his activities and under the two articles of the charter, could well terminate his activities.

However, I am sure you would all agree with the United States delegation that host governments are entitled to protect and exercise their sovereign rights within their territories, and very possibly by exercising such sovereign rights honest differences can arise.

We are most desirous to minimize the chances of such a conflict, and we want to see each host government given a regard for its sovereignty—which any free nation is entitled to exercise.

Together, however, with this legitimate desire of the host governments to exercise fully their sovereign rights, we must consider the fact that the mandate of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency has a little more than 3 years to run. My Government believes that this body should now commence assisting the agency and the governments as best it can in preparing against the eventual termination of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency's activities in orderly planning and in fairness to the host governments and the welfare of the refugees. We believe that the Director of the agency should, after consultations with the host governments, prepare for submission to the 12th General Assembly specific proposals—without prejudice, of course, to the refugees' right of repatriation or compensation—for future implementation of the various responsibilities with which the agency is now charged.

The third and most important problem that I have referred to is contributions. I think most of the speakers here have agreed with Mr. Labouisse in his desire to undertake improvements—a desire he has expressed in all his reports. My delegation is in complete accord, but we do

¹ U.N. docs. A/3212 and Add. 1.

not think that only a few governments and particularly the United States can and should assume full financial responsibility for insuring the welfare of the refugees.

We will always stand ready to match generosity, but we have all agreed over and over again here at the United Nations when we have discussed other contributions—United Nations Children's Fund, technical assistance, etc.—that the very health and moral fiber of the United Nations is not served by contributions from a limited number of nations. One reason why there is so much interest, so much support, in the United Nations Children's Fund and technical assistance programs is because, in 1956, 79 countries completed their contributions to the United Nations Children's Fund and, in 1956, 61 countries pledged to the Technical Assistance Program.

Let's put all our efforts in a wider basis for pledging of contributions and, if possible, larger contributions. By contributions from more countries, by increased contributions, we can then foresee better standards of relief as requested by the Director. If, on the other hand, contributions fall short of the budget requirements, then the Director will have no choice—and it will be a tragic and unfortunate choice—but to reduce the already meager services to the refugees. If this tragedy should happen and services have to be reduced, we wish that food and clothing be the very last to suffer.

Mr. Chairman, now let us turn to the question of the rehabilitation fund. In the past my Government has always actively supported substantial rehabilitation programs. By this we mean programs that would improve the welfare of the refugee, provide him with a sense of security and a sense of belonging among his Arab brethren, but at the same time not prejudice his right to repatriation or compensation. Many diligent efforts have been made—such as those devoted to the development of the Jordan Valley, made by my Government. Unfortunately, agreements for these projects have not materialized although, as the Director has indicated, they have proved feasible and technically sound. We are still hopeful that projects will be agreed upon which will accomplish economic benefits to both the governments involved and to the refugees.

Therefore, we would like to suggest that the Director's discretion with regard to use of rehabilitation funds be broadened to the extent that

he may in his discretion disburse moneys from the rehabilitation fund for general economic development projects, subject only to agreement by the recipient government that within a fixed period it will assume financial responsibility for an agreed number of refugees. We think, Mr. Chairman, in making such a suggestion that the projects which may be agreed upon can really benefit the economies of the Arab world and will also contribute to the welfare of the refugees. In line with our interest in maintaining the rehabilitation fund, I can assure this Committee that my Government is presently making plans for a further contribution to the rehabilitation fund.

Mr. Chairman, I want to again express our admiration for the work which the Director of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency has done. If one single example is needed to demonstrate the efficiency and capacity of the Director and the agency, it can be found in the special report of the Director concerning the agency's activities in the Gaza Strip between November 1st and mid-December of last year.² Despite military operations and the deplorable damage and loss of life, my Government feels that it can truly say "well done" to the brilliant performance of the agency.

May I again appeal to all countries to remember that in this problem we are not dealing with a political situation as such. We are dealing with human beings who deserve more of our sympathy and consideration than they have received in the past.

STATEMENT OF FEBRUARY 22

U.S. delegation press release 2628

This Committee now has before it a draft resolution which has the cosponsorship and support of the United States. Much of its language is familiar to us since the problem has been long before us and, regrettably, will be before us probably for some years to come. I say regrettably because human beings and their sufferings are involved. It is in a continued and renewed effort to assist in the alleviation of this mass misery that the United States hopes that this resolution will receive the large majority support it warrants.

Mr. Chairman, as we see it, this resolution faces

² U.N. doc. A/3212 Add. 1.

facts, many of which are regrettable, particularly in the fourth, fifth, and sixth preambular paragraphs, which relate to the inadequacy of contributions, to the fact that the hope of repatriation or compensation has not been fulfilled, and that, as the Director had to point out most unhappily in his report, cooperation between certain host governments and the agency has been inadequate. We believe it necessary that there be improvement on all of these points in the coming year or else the agency cannot hope to carry out its mandate.

The first operative paragraph also faces facts in that it should be an earnest effort on the part of the Director and the governments concerned to plan ahead in such a manner that the relationships between the agency and the host governments are so adjusted that the responsibilities with which the agency is now charged may carry on into the future in a manner best designed to insure the future welfare of the refugees and face the fact that the mandate of the agency by Resolution 818 (IX) is ended on June 30, 1960. In urging this step we want to stress that what we are asking the Director to do is in no way prejudicing the rights of the refugees or prejudging the solution of this problem. We fully appreciate the difficulties which the host governments may be forced to face, and this body should in the future be prepared to consider what those difficulties may be and what it can do about them. It is for this reason that we believe the Director should report to the next General Assembly along the lines indicated in the first operative paragraph. For our part, the United States stands ready to be of such assistance as may be indicated. The second operative paragraph is a reminder to all of us that the agency has certain rights and privileges which we must all respect if it is to function as expected of it. Accordingly, we believe it appropriate to request of the host governments the necessary cooperation with the agency and with its personnel and to extend to them every appropriate assistance in carrying out their functions.

The third operative paragraph is traditional in resolutions on this problem in that it directs the agency to pursue its programs, bearing in mind the limitations imposed upon it by the contributions.

The fourth operative paragraph indicates our continued interest and concern that rehabilitation projects capable of supporting a substantial number of refugees be sought and carried out. The

United States has given much thought to this matter and still believes that it is in the interests of the Arab peoples themselves that projects be found which will not only benefit the refugees but can have a profoundly beneficial effect on the Arab governments. For this reason, we are proposing in operative paragraph 5 that the Director's authority be broadened from what it has been to permit him to use rehabilitation funds, as they may be available, to arrange with individual host governments for general economic development projects. We believe that such arrangements should involve agreement on the part of any host government that within a fixed period of time it will assume financial responsibility for an agreed number of refugees. Certainly it is in the interests of all concerned that every effort be made to reduce the refugee problem as rapidly as possible. We are hopeful that this broader discretion will be of great assistance.

The remaining operative paragraphs are familiar in that they request the agency to continue its consultations with the Palestine Conciliation Commission. It reiterates its appeal to private organizations and governments to assist in meeting the serious needs of other claimants for relief in the area. It requests the Negotiating Committee for Extrabudgetary Funds to continue to seek the financial assistance needed and, most important of all, urges all governments to increase their contributions to the extent necessary to carry through the agency's programs.

The tenth operative paragraph takes cognizance of the fearless and courageous work of faithful international servants who continue to carry out the program for the refugees in the Gaza Strip following the recent hostilities. The Director and the agency ought to be commended for this initiative.

Finally, it expresses the General Assembly's thanks to the Director and the staff of the agency for their continued faithful efforts. Thanks are also always due to the many private organizations which have for so long continued their valuable work in assisting the refugees.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, may I say that it is our hope that the passage of this resolution will lend new vitality to the efforts of all of us in helping to assist and solve the Arab refugee problem. It is the conviction of my Government that failure to act in the affirmative way which we propose can have most unfortunate results for the refugees,

and they should come first in the minds of all of us here.

TEXT OF RESOLUTION³

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 194 (III) of 11 December 1948, 302 (IV) of 8 December 1949, 393 (V) of 2 December 1950, 513 (VI) of 26 January 1952, 614 (VII) of 6 November 1952, 720 (VIII) of 27 November 1953, 818 (IX) of 4 December 1954 and 916 (X) of 3 December 1955,

Noting the annual report and the special report of the Director of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East and the report of the Advisory Commission of the Agency,⁴

Having reviewed the budget for relief and rehabilitation prepared by the Director of the Agency,

Noting with concern that contributions thereto are not yet sufficient,

Noting that repatriation or compensation of the refugees, as provided for in paragraph 11 of resolution 194 (III), has not been effected, that no substantial progress has been made in the programme endorsed in paragraph 2 of resolution 513 (VI) for the reintegration of refugees and that therefore the situation of the refugees continues to be a matter of serious concern,

Noting that the host Governments have expressed the wish that the Agency continue to carry out its mandate in their respective countries or territories and have expressed their wish to co-operate fully with the Agency and to extend to it every appropriate assistance in carrying out its functions, in accordance with the provisions of Articles 104 and 105 of the Charter of the United Nations, the terms of the Convention of Privileges and Immunities, the contents of paragraph 17 of its resolution 302 (IV) of 8 December 1949 and the terms of the agreements with the host Governments,

1. Directs the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East to pursue its programmes for the relief and rehabilitation of refugees, bearing in mind the limitation imposed upon it by the extent of the contributions for the fiscal year;

2. Requests the host Governments to co-operate fully with the Agency and with its personnel and to extend to it every appropriate assistance in carrying out its functions;

3. Requests the Governments of the area, without prejudice to paragraph 11 of resolution 194 (III), in co-operation with the Director of the Agency, to plan and carry out projects capable of supporting substantial numbers of refugees;

4. Requests the Agency to continue its consultation with the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Pales-

³ U.N. doc. A/Res/524; adopted by the Special Political Committee on Feb. 23 (A/SPC/L.13/Rev. 2) by a vote of 66 to 0 with 1 abstention (Iraq) and by the General Assembly on Feb. 28 by a vote of 68 to 0 with 1 abstention (Iraq).

⁴ U.N. doc. A/3498.

tine in the best interest of their respective tasks, with particular reference to paragraph 11 of resolution 194 (III);

5. Decides to retain the rehabilitation fund and authorizes the Director in his discretion to disburse such monies, as may be available, to the individual host Governments for general economic development projects, subject to agreement by any such Government that within a fixed period of time it will assume financial responsibility for an agreed number of refugees, such number to be commensurate with the cost of the project without prejudice to paragraph 11 of resolution 194 (III);

6. Reiterates its appeal to private organizations and Governments to assist in meeting the serious needs of other claimants for relief as referred to in paragraph 5 of resolution 916 (X);

7. Requests the Negotiating Committee for Extra Budgetary Funds, after receipt of the requests for contributions from the Director of the Agency, to seek the financial assistance needed from the United Nations Members;

8. Urges all Governments to contribute or to increase their contributions to the extent necessary to carry through to fulfilment the Agency's relief and rehabilitation programmes;

9. Notes with approval the action of the Agency in continuing to carry out its programme for the refugees in the Gaza Strip;

10. Expresses its thanks to the Director and the staff of the Agency for continued faithful efforts to carry out its mandate, and to the specialized agencies and the many private organizations for their valuable and continuing work in assisting the refugees;

11. Notes that the Agency is changing its financial period from a fiscal to a calendar year basis and that consequently the current budgets cover an 18-month period from 1 July 1956 to 31 December 1957, and that special arrangements for the audit of funds in this period are being made with the United Nations Board of Auditors;

12. Requests the Director of the Agency to continue to submit the reports referred to in paragraph 21 of resolution 302 (IV) as modified by paragraph 11 above.

TREATY INFORMATION

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Customs Tariffs

Protocol modifying the convention signed at Brussels July 5, 1890 (26 Stat. 1518), creating an international union for the publication of customs tariffs. Done at Brussels December 16, 1949. Entered into force May 5, 1950.¹
Adherence deposited: Rumania, February 13, 1957.

¹ Not in force for the United States.

Trade and Commerce

Agreement on Organization for Trade Cooperation. Done at Geneva March 10, 1955.³

Notification deposited (recognizing signature as binding): Austria, February 11, 1957.

Protocol of rectification to French text of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Done at Geneva June 15, 1955. Entered into force October 24, 1956, for those provisions which relate to parts II and III of the General Agreement. TIAS 3677.

Notification deposited (recognizing signature as binding): Austria, February 11, 1957.

Sixth protocol of supplementary concessions to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Done at Geneva May 23, 1956. Entered into force June 30, 1956. TIAS 3591.

Schedules of concessions enter into force: Dominican Republic, April 10, 1957.

Wheat

International wheat agreement, 1956. Open for signature at Washington through May 18, 1956. Entered into force July 16, 1956, for parts 1, 3, 4, and 5, and August 1, 1956, for part 2. TIAS 3709.

Acceptance deposited: Lebanon, March 20, 1957.

BILATERAL

Dominican Republic

Agreement for establishment of a long range radio aid to navigation station at Cape Frances Viejo. Signed at Washington March 19, 1957. Entered into force March 19, 1957.

France

Agreement to facilitate interchange of patent rights and technical information for defense purposes. Signed at Paris March 12, 1957. Entered into force March 12, 1957.

Greece

Agreement further amending the agricultural commodities agreement of August 8, 1956, as amended January 21, 1957 (TIAS 3633, 3741), by providing for the purchase of additional wheat. Effectuated by exchange of notes at Athens March 1 and 4, 1957. Entered into force March 4, 1957.

Agreement amending the agricultural commodities agreement of August 8, 1956 (TIAS 3633), by providing for the purchase of wheat with funds allotted for the purchase of lard. Effectuated by exchange of notes at Athens February 13 and 23, 1957. Entered into force February 23, 1957.

Jordan

Agreement amending the agreement of May 1 and June 29, 1954 (TIAS 3145), relating to duty-free entry and defrayment of inland transportation charges for relief supplies and packages. Effectuated by exchange of notes at Amman July 6, September 28, and October 15, 1955. Entered into force September 28, 1955. (Substitution for exchange of notes of March 15 and 24, 1955, listed in BULLETIN of May 9, 1955.)

Switzerland

Exchange of notes at Washington March 1 and 4, 1957, approving the agreed minute of February 6, 1957, relating to interpretation of the air transport agreement of August 3, 1945, as amended (TIAS 1576, 1929). Entered into force March 4, 1957.

³ Not in force.

DEPARTMENT AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Designations

Norman B. Hannah as Special Assistant to the Deputy Under Secretary for Administration, effective March 11.

Charles Whitehouse as Special Assistant to the Deputy Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, effective March 11.

Max V. Krebs as Special Assistant to the Under Secretary, effective March 24.

Check List of Department of State Press Releases: March 18-24

Releases may be obtained from the News Division, Department of State, Washington 25, D. C.

Press releases issued prior to March 18 which appear in this issue of the BULLETIN are Nos. 119 and 122 of March 7 and 143 of March 13.

No.	Date	Subject
*153	3/18	Educational exchange.
154	3/18	Dulles: death of President Magsaysay.
155	3/18	Meeting of Secretary Dulles and Mrs. Meir.
156	3/18	Progress on Inter-American Highway.
†157	3/19	Phillips: statement on plant protection convention.
*158	3/18	Drew nominated Ambassador to Haiti (biographic details).
*159	3/18	Bonsal nominated Ambassador to Bolivia (biographic details).
160	3/19	Wilcox: "The United Nations and Public Understanding."
161	3/19	Agreement with Dominican Republic for LORAN station.
*162	3/19	Young nominated Ambassador to Netherlands (biographic details).
163	3/19	U.S.-Netherlands air transport negotiations.
*164	3/20	Educational exchange.
†165	3/21	Polish coal mining officials visit U.S.
166	3/21	Exchange of letters with the Netherlands on civil air negotiations.
167	3/21	New U.S. member of Iraq Development Board.
*168	3/21	Educational exchange.
*169	3/22	Bohlen nominated Ambassador to Philippines (biographic details).
†170	3/22	Fifth anniversary of Escapee Program.
*171	3/22	Russell nominated Ambassador to New Zealand (biographic details).
172	3/23	Eisenhower: anniversary of Pakistan Republic.
173	3/23	Signing of income-tax protocol with Japan.

*Not printed.

†Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.

American Republics	
Inter-American Highway Nearing Completion	
U.S. Contribution To Help Fight Malaria in American Republics (Milton Eisenhower, Mora, Soper)	
Atomic Energy. United States and United Kingdom Exchange Views at Bermuda Meeting (text of joint communique)	
Aviation	
Air Transport Agreement Between United States and Mexico (text)	
U.S. and Netherlands Resume Air Transport Negotiations (Eisenhower, Drees)	
Belgium. Notice of Intention To Enter Into Limited Trade Agreement Negotiations With the United Kingdom and Belgium	
Communism. The Cold War and the Universities (Oechsner)	
Congress, The. Amending the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Lightner)	
Department and Foreign Service. Designations (Hannah, Whitehouse, Krebs)	
Dominican Republic. U.S.-Dominican Agreement on LORAN Station	
Economic Affairs	
Inter-American Highway Nearing Completion	
New U.S. Member Assumes Duties on Iraq Development Board	
Notice of Intention To Enter Into Limited Trade Agreement Negotiations With the United Kingdom and Belgium	
President Asks Study of Tariff Quota on Alsike Clover Seed	
President Decides Against Study of Tariff on Hatters' Fur	
President Orders Investigation of Effects of Tung Oil Imports	
United States and Japan Sign Income-Tax Protocol	
Educational Exchange. Amending the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Lightner)	
Europe. United States and United Kingdom Exchange Views at Bermuda Meeting (text of joint communique)	
Health, Education, and Welfare	
The Cold War and the Universities (Oechsner)	
U.S. Contribution To Help Fight Malaria in American Republics (Milton Eisenhower, Mora, Soper)	
Hungary. The United Nations and Public Understanding (Wilcox)	
Iraq. New U.S. Member Assumes Duties on Iraq Development Board	
Israel. Meeting Between Secretary Dulles and Israeli Foreign Minister (text of statement)	
Japan. United States and Japan Sign Income-Tax Protocol	
Mexico. Air Transport Agreement Between United States and Mexico (text)	
Middle East	
Meeting Between Secretary Dulles and Israeli Foreign Minister (text of statement)	
The United Nations and Public Understanding (Wilcox)	555
U.N. Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees (Lord)	585
United States and United Kingdom Exchange Views at Bermuda Meeting (text of joint communique)	561
Mutual Security. United States and United Kingdom Exchange Views at Bermuda Meeting (text of joint communique)	561
Netherlands. U.S. and Netherlands Resume Air Transport Negotiations (Eisenhower, Drees)	579
Pakistan. Anniversary of Establishment of Pakistan as Republic (Eisenhower)	563
Philippines. Death of President Magsaysay of the Philippines (Eisenhower, Dulles)	563
Presidential Documents	
Anniversary of Establishment of Pakistan as Republic	563
Death of President Magsaysay of the Philippines: President Orders Investigation of Effects of Tung Oil Imports	563
U.S. and Netherlands Resume Air Transport Negotiations (Eisenhower, Drees)	585
Refugees. U.N. Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees (Lord)	579
Treaty Information	
Air Transport Agreement Between United States and Mexico	575
Current Actions	589
United States and Japan Sign Income-Tax Protocol	574
U.S. and Netherlands Resume Air Transport Negotiations (Eisenhower, Drees)	574
U.S.-Dominican Agreement on LORAN Station	574
United Kingdom	
Notice of Intention To Enter Into Limited Trade Agreement Negotiations With the United Kingdom and Belgium	581
United States and United Kingdom Exchange Views at Bermuda Meeting (text of joint communique)	561
United Nations	
The United Nations and Public Understanding (Wilcox)	555
U.N. Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees (Lord)	585
United States and United Kingdom Exchange Views at Bermuda Meeting (text of joint communique)	561
Name Index	
Drees, Willem	580
Dulles, Secretary	562, 563
Eisenhower, Milton S	565
Eisenhower, President	561, 563, 580, 585
Hannah, Norman B	590
Krebs, Max V	590
Lightner, E. Allan, Jr	566
Lord, Mrs. Oswald B	585
Macmillan, Harold	561
Magsaysay, Ramon	563
Meir, Golda	562
Mora, José A	565
Oechsner, Frederick Cable	571
Soper, Fred L	565
Whitehouse, Charles	590
Wilcox, Francis O	555
Willson, Clifford	563



the
Department
of
State

Order Form

To: Supt. of Documents
Govt. Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

Enclosed find:

\$.....
(cash, check, or
money order).

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE TO AVOID
PAYMENT OF POSTAGE, \$300
(GPO)

Foreign Relations of the United States

**The basic source of information on
U. S. diplomatic history**

1939, Volume II

General, The British Commonwealth, and Europe

The first 212 pages of this volume contain papers on various general subjects: Antarctic claims and exploration, assistance to refugees, fisheries off the coast of Alaska, and a number of technical economic problems.

Documentation on relations with the British Commonwealth (pp. 213-364) includes sections on the United Kingdom, Australia, Canada, and India. Problems of relations between the United States as a neutral and the British as belligerents are covered, as well as other usual matters of diplomacy. Among the war subjects treated is the sinking of the S.S. *Athenia* with loss of American lives. It was only after the war that it was fully established that this was an act of a German submarine.

The remaining 534 pages of documentation cover relations with individual continental European countries. The Soviet Union is omitted, since the record for that country has already been published in *Foreign Relations of the United States, The Soviet Union, 1933-1939*. As would be expected for a year in which the general European war began, subjects of diplomacy included normal peacetime diplomatic relations as well as subjects connected with the crises leading to war and into the war itself. While the coming of the war is primarily treated in volume I, this volume contains the record on the absorption of Albania by Italy, problems arising from the annexation of Austria by Germany, and the Spanish Civil War. In the section on Italy are recorded suggestions by President Roosevelt regarding the opportunity for Mussolini to contribute to the maintenance of peace. The appointment of Myron C. Taylor as the President's personal representative to Pope Pius XII is documented in a section on the Vatican.

Copies of this publication may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., for \$4 each.

Please send me copies of *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1939, Volume II, General, The British Commonwealth, and Europe*.

Name: _____

Street Address: _____

City, Zone, and State: _____

